The HEIDEGGER–JASPERS CORRESPONDENCE (1920–1963)

Also available in Contemporary Studies in Philosophy and the Human Sciences

---

Series Editors: Hugh J. Silverman and Graeme Nicholson

Before Ethics

Adriaan Peperzak

Beyond Metaphysics

John Llewelyn

The Deconstruction of Time

David Wood

Dialectic and Difference: Modern Thought and the Sense of Human Limits

Jacques Taminiaux

Elucidations of Holderlin's Poetry

Martin Heidegger Translated by Keith Hoeller

God and Being: Heidegger's Relation to Theology

Jeff Owen Prudhomme

Heidegger and the Question of Time

Francoise Dastur Translated by Francois Raffoul and David Pettigrew

Heidegger and the Subject

Francois Raffoul Translated by David Pettigrew and Gregory Recco

History of Hermeneutics

Maurizio Ferraris

Illustrations of Being: Drawing upon Heidegger and upon Metaphysics

Graeme Nicholson

In the Presence of the Sensuous: Essays in Aesthetics

Mikel Dufrenne Edited by Mark S. Roberts and Dennis Gallagher

The Language of Difference,

Charles E. Scott

Language and the Unconscious Jacques Lacan's Hermeneutics of Psychoanalysis

Hermann Lang

Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking

Otto Pdggeler

Michel Foucault's Force of Flight: Toward an Ethics for Thought

James WBernauer

The Paths of Heidegger's Life and Thought

Otto Pdggeler

Political Philosophy at the Closure of Metaphysics

Bernard Flynn

The Question of Language in Heidegger's History of Being

Robert Bernasconi

Rationalities, Historicities

Dominique Janicaud Translated by Nina Belmonte

Sensation: Intelligibility Is Sensibility

Alphonso Lingis

Structuralism: A Philosophy for the Human Sciences

Peter Caws

The Incarnate Subject: Malebranche, Biran, and Bergson on the Union of Body and Soul

Maurice Merleau-Ponty

Texts and Dialogues

Maurice Merleau-Ponty

Utopics: The Semiological Play of Textual Spaces

Louis Marin

CONTEMPORARY STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY AND THE HUMAN SCIENCES

The HEIDEGGER–JASPERS CORRESPONDENCE (1920–1963)

Edited by Walter Biemel and Hans Saner

Translated by

GARY E. AYLESWORTH

an imprint of Prometheus Books
59 John Glenn Drive, Amherst, New York 14228-2197

Originally published as Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers, *Martin Heidegger/Karl Jaspers Briefwechsel: 1920–1963*, edited by Walter Biemel and Hans Saner (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Vittorio Klostermann, 1990; Munich: Piper, 1990).

Published 2003 by Humanity Books, an imprint of Prometheus Books

The Heidegger–Jaspers Correspondence. Copyright © 2003 edited by Walter Biemel and Hans Saner. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, or conveyed via the Internet or a Web site without prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Inquiries should be addressed to
Humanity Books
59 John Glenn Drive
Amherst, New York 14228–2197
VOICE: 716–691–0133, ext. 207
FAX: 716–564–2711

07 06 05 04 03 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Heidegger, Martin, 1889–1976
[Correspondence, English. Selections]
The Heidegger–Jaspers correspondence (1920–1963) / edited by Walter Biemel and Hans Saner ; translated by Gary E. Aylesworth.
p. cm.—(Contemporary studies in philosophy and the human sciences series)
Translation of: Briefwechsel 1920–1963. c1990.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 1–59102–060–3 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Heidegger, Martin, 1889–1976—Correspondence. 2. Jaspers, Karl, 1883–1969—Correspondence. 3. Philosophers—Germany—Correspondence. I. Jaspers, Karl, 1883–1969. II. Biemel, Walter. III. Saner, Hans, 1934– IV. Title. V. Contemporary studies in philosophy and the human sciences.

B3279.H485 2003
193—dc21
[B] 2003044991

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

EDITORS' REMARKS

THE CORRESPONDENCE:

1 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/21/1920

2 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 1/21/1921

3 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 1/22/1921

4 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 1/24/1921

5 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/25/1921

6 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/28/1921

7 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 8/1/1921

8 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 8/5/1921

9 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/27/1922

10 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/2/1922

11 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 9/6/1922

12 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 11/19/1922

13 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 11/24/1922

14 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/19/1923

15 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/20/1923

16 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/14/1923

17 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 9/2/1923

18 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/9/1923

19 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 11/4/1923

20 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/17/1924

21 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/2/1924

22 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/18/1924

23 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/19/1925

24 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/21/1925

25 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/24/1925

26 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 9/23/1925

27 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/2/1925

28 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 11/30/1925

29 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/10/1925

30 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/16/1925

31 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 2/17/1926

32 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/24/1926

33 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/24/1926

34 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/31/1926

35 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/4/1926

36 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 10/27/1926

37 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/2/1926

38 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/21/1926

39 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/26/1926

40 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/30/1926

41 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 3/1/1927

42 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/2/1927

43 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/18/1927

44 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/1/1927

45 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/8/1927

46 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 9/27/1927

47 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 10/1/1927

48 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/6/1927

49 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/19/1927

50 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 11/8/1927

51 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 1/4/1928

52 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 1/14/1928

53 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 2/10/1928

54 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 2/12/1928

55 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 2/25/1928

56 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 3/6/1928

57 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/23/1928

58 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 3/25/1928

59 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/13/1928

60 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/1/1928

61 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/4/1928

62 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/13/1928

63 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/15/1928

64 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/2/1928

65 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/4/1928

66 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/6/1928

67 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/11/1928

68 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/29/1928

69 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/8/1928

70 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 9/24/1928

71 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 10/2/1928

72 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/30/1928

73 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 11/3/1928

74 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 11/10/1928

75 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 11/12/1928

76 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/1/1928

77 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/3/1928

78 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/19/1928

79 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/20/1928

80 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/21/1928

81 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 4/6/1929

82 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/14/1929

83 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/20/1929

84 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/25/1929

85 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/7/1929

86 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/14/1929

87 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/30/1929

88 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/8/1929

89 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 10/10/1929

90 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 10/18/1929

91 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 10/21/1929

92 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/1/1929

93 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/2/1929

94 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/2/1929

95 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/5/1929

96 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 3/29/1930

97 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/29/1930

98 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/30/1930

99 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/1/1930

100 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/2/1930

101 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/17/1930

102 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/24/1930

103 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/5/1930

104 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/13/1930

105 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/15/1930

106 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/19/1931

107 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/24/1931

108 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/25/1931

109 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/20/1931

110 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/24/1931

111 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/8/1932

112 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/10/1933

113 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 3/16/1933

114 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/3/1933

115 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 4/20/1933

116 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/24/1933

117 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/23/1933

118 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/25/1933

119 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 8/23/1933

120 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/1/1935

121 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/14/1936

122 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/16/1936

123 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/16/1936

124 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 10/12/1942

125 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/1/1948

126 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 2/6/1949

127 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 6/22/1949

128 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 6/25/1949

129 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 7/5/1949

130 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/10/1949

131 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 8/6/1949

132 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 8/12/1949

133 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 8/17/1949

134 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 9/21/1949

135 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 9/23/1949

136 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 11/23/1949

137 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 11/25/1949

138 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 12/2/1949

139 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 12/10/1949

140 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 1/14/1950

141 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 3/7/1950

142 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/19/1950

143 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/25/1950

144 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 4/8/1950

145 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/12/1950

146 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/15/1950

147 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 5/16/1950

148 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 5/26/1950

149 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 7/24/1952

150 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 2/19/1953

151 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 4/3/1953

152 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 9/22/1959

153 Martin Heidegger to Karl Jaspers 2/23/1963

154 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/25/1963

155 Karl Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/26/1963

156 Martin Heidegger to Gertrud Jaspers 3/2/1969

157 Gertrud Jaspers to Martin Heidegger 3/2/1969

APPENDIX

EDITORS' NOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HEIDEGGER AND JASPERS WORKS CITED

INDEX

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

The history of German philosophy is the history of philosophy professors, and the letters contained in this volume are written by two of the foremost among them. Because the academic and philosophical context of the exchange of letters between Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers might be unfamiliar to a general reader, I offer some background in order to facilitate a clearer understanding of the correspondence and documents presented here.

In the letters, one is immediately confronted with references to academic ranks, titles, and procedures that are unfamiliar to an American audience; this holds as well for the division and organization of the academic faculties. The following description will characterize the German university of the 1920s, the time of the most intensive correspondence between Heidegger and Jaspers, and the most formative period of their philosophizing. Many of its features still hold today.

The German university is divided into four faculties (more or less equivalent to those in American universities) each headed by a Dean (Dekan): medicine, law, theology, and philosophy. The first three are concerned with professional training in their respective areas, and the philosophy faculty contains the liberal arts and sciences, including, of course, philosophy as a separate discipline. It should be noted, however, that when reference is made to the philosophy faculty, any number of disciplines may be meant, e.g., ancient history or economics.

Another concern is the order of academic ranks. These designations derive from the Prussian General Code of 1794 and the Disciplinary Law of 1852, and are arranged as follows: a Professor Ordinarius draws a regular salary from the Ministry of Culture with a rank equal to a Councillor of State 4th or 3rd class, and is also compensated with lecture and examination fees paid by the students; a university Rector (President) holds a rank and draws a salary equal to a Councillor of State 2nd class; a Professor Extraordinarius also draws a regular salary from the Ministry with a rank equal to a Councillor of State 5th class, and is also compensated with student fees; a Privatdozent (Lecturer) is not a government official and does not enjoy a regular salary but is compensated with lecture fees alone. The Dozent has earned the right to teach at a university, the venia legendi, by completing the doctoral degree and then writing a second, qualifying dissertation-the Habilitation. In addition to these designations, a very distinguished professor may be rewarded with an even higher personal title, e.g., Gebeimrat (Privy Councillor). Needless to say, those who hold the rank of Professor Ordinarius enjoy much more power, security and prestige than a mere Dozent.

Through governing committees made up of senior professors, the faculties are supposed to enjoy a high degree of autonomy in academic matters; however, final decisions on faculty appointments are made by the Minister of Culture for the region where each university is located. In the state of Baden, which includes the universities of Freiburg and Heidelberg, the Ministry is located in Karlsruhe. Recommendations are made by a faculty committee (usually appointed by the academic senate) and consist of a list of three candidates in the order of preference. The Minister is pledged to consider these recommendations but may also overrule them. Such was the case, for example, when Heidegger was initially recom mended to succeed Nicolai Hartmann to the Ordinariate in philosophy at Marburg (although Heidegger was indeed eventually appointed to the post). Appointment committees regularly solicit outside evaluations of candidates from those who are prominent in their fields, and these evaluations can be decisive. Once a candidate receives the call (Ruf) to a position, issues such as salary, benefits, and teaching duties are negotiated with the Ministry.

As is evident in the Heidegger and Jaspers letters, the evaluation of candidates for degrees and appointments always includes a consideration of their personal characteristics. This is a natural feature of a system in which there are no standardized criteria for awarding degrees or the venia legendi. The doctoral dissertation is completed under the direction of a single professor, who is responsible for evaluating and deciding its suitability for awarding the degree; likewise the qualifying dissertation, the Habilitation. Thus individual professors decide the fate of their students (and junior colleagues) and exercise absolute authority in awarding degrees and deciding upon qualifications. In this way, the most powerful professors can literally define the standards for their own discipline and enforce these standards through personal intervention. Appointments to the most senior professorships are, therefore, of crucial political and disciplinary importance.

This having been said, an underlying assumption behind these practices is that the highest intellectual achievements can only be evaluated on an individual, indeed personal, level. This is due in large part to the legacy of German Idealism, whose values shaped university life since the early nineteenth century. According to this tradition, the purpose of the university is cultivation (Bildung) and science (Wissenschaft), both achieving their highest perfection in the personality of the most outstanding teachers and researchers.

Although science is a standard translation for Wissenschaft, the German concept is much broader than the narrower sense the word has in English. It includes any organized discipline and its methods of research but, most importantly, it conveys an attitude toward the subject under investigation, an attitude of comprehensive interest and systematic understanding, combined with a sense of higher cul tural values. Science, then, is not supposed to be value free. Bildung, or cultivation, is conceived as the formation of a uniquely developed personality and is, therefore, inseparable from true Wissenschaft; thus the most distinguished professors are supposed to present a living synthesis of their discipline, a sense of the whole, unified under the higher values of a fully developed and original personality.

Both Heidegger and Jaspers subscribe to this ideal, and, as their letters attest, both are disillusioned over how things actually go among professors-and among professors of philosophy in particular. This disillusionment is a key to their shared sense of mission when they met for the first time in 1920 on the occasion of Edmund Husserl's sixty-first birthday. This meeting led to Heidegger's subsequent visits to Jaspers in Heidelberg and to their decades-long correspondence. The philosophical basis of their friendship, which for a time they conceived as a philosophical comradeship-in-arms, is inseparable from their mutual rejection of the doctrinal content and academic presentation of the schools of philosophy (such as Neokantianism) that dominated the universities between the wars.

Instead of the Professorenphilosophie that surrounded them, both thinkers insisted upon philosophizing as an existential passion, an enactment that puts into question the ultimate freedom and being of the one who philosophizes, including the predominant social, cultural, and political values against which, and through which, existence is experienced. Aside from their shared appreciation for Kierkegaard, however, their philosophical relationship is less evident. (For Jaspers, if not for Heidegger, this difficulty was the subject of extensive reflection.) Both insist it is a mistake to join them together under the rubric of existentialism while, at times and however intermittently, both seemed convinced that the future of philosophy itself may depend upon a radical coming to terms between them.

From the outset, the two philosophers acknowledge their debt to Kierkegaard, who emphatically stressed the nonconceptualizable fact of human existence, but their departure from Kierkegaard takes them in different directions.

In the 1920s, Heidegger made a name for himself as a philosopher who transforms Kierkegaard's religious quest for faith without grounds into an uncompromising philosophical questioning of the grounds of being. Philosophy for Heidegger is an enactment of thought, a philosophizing that puts into question that which is to be thought in the first place, the matter (Sache) toward which it directs itself if it is to be about anything at all. From

the outset, then, Heidegger's thought is ontological. It concerns being as a question of what and how there is anything to think (about) to begin with.

Just as Kierkegaard insists that faith is an ultimate, inward gesture of consciousness that must be renewed in every moment, Heidegger stresses that philosophical questioning must always be a beginning and that all genuine thinking begins anew in its own time. Indeed, time (not consciousness!) is the deep horizon of the giving of the matter to be thought. Coupled with this concept of time, Heidegger radicalizes Husserl's method of phenomenological description in order to reveal the "giving of the matter of thought" as a showing of being. In the 1920s, Heidegger calls this philosophical revealing formal indication, which, since it must begin ever anew and ever in different times, cannot be formalized into a method or a doctrine. Instead, it must achieve concretion by destroying, or pulling back, everything that blocks access to the immediacy of the moment of being itself. Formal indication cannot ever commit itself to a particular moment or interpretation of being but must remain open to the constancy of the Sache, which is without principle or ground and which, therefore, cannot become the object of a science.

If the matter of thought is not an object of thought, there can be no objectifying approach to it. Instead, Heidegger understands method as a way to the matter, without grasping and holding it conceptually. The way is through language, which Heidegger believes can reveal the depth of immediacy as an indicating, or pointing, such that we see what shows itself in the moment. The phenomenological function of language is, therefore, to reveal what is to be seen, to prompt it to emerge from hiddenness. In this respect, the matter of thought occurs in its truth, understood as aletheia or unconcealment.

In characterizing the free and anarchic quality of this occurrence, Heidegger emphasizes the facticity or suddenness of its happening. That it occurs is stunning and uncanny and, indeed, uncanniness is itself a sign that we have been touched by its originary power. The strangeness of Heidegger's language is, in his view, a requirement of the Sache itself: Language must destroy traditional and everyday meanings, including the

meanings of scientific and metaphysical propositions, in order to reveal that and how there is given to be anything to be thought or said at all. And in the face of the uncanniness of the matter, the ultimate indicative gesture of language is silence. Only in the silence of the uncanny are we confronted with our own factical existence, which shows up as a response to, and an echo of, the impact of being.

The emphatic questioning of being at work in formal indication is the backdrop for Heidegger's critical review of Jaspers's Psychology of Worldviews, which Heidegger shared with Jaspers as the occasion for their first public philosophical confrontation. The gist of the critique is that Jaspers is too uncritical of historically handeddown concepts and classifications (of worldviews), that he does not radically question their historicity, and by merely observing worldviews as psychological phenomena and classifying them according to formal types reveals them in their underlying truth. Jaspers, he claims, does not appreciate the facticity of the I, which exists in my own factual life and which in turn is not the individuation of a universal type or a location within a taxonomic system. For Heidegger, rather, the deep horizon of temporality opens the self, via formal indication, to the claim of the matter, as that which I am called upon to think in response.

At first Jaspers is deeply struck by this critique. But he later claims that it does not resonate for him and does not lead him to any new insights. Furthermore, despite his personal affinity with Heidegger, there is much in Heidegger's philosophizing that he finds disturbing.

In his three-volume Philosophy (1931), which is the culmination of his work in the 1920s, Jaspers lays out a way of philosophizing that also takes its departure from Kierkegaard. However, unlike Hei degger, Jaspers's thinking retains the radical inwardness of faith and the appeal to personal consciousness. This inwardness is philosophical rather than religious: It is an attitude of openness to being rather than a resolution in the face of a transcendent and inconceivable God. As he insists, philosophy is "an expression of faith without revelation." This means, as well, that being is not a Sache in Heidegger's sense but a possibility of my being first and foremost.

Philosophizing, at its core, is about Existenz, my possibility for existing, and is not dependent upon any nonpersonal origin or event. Its movement transforms the consciousness of the one who philosophizes by directing consciousness back to its own roots. These roots are never revealed but are illuminated in enacting them as possibilities for my relations with the world and with others.

Thus, for Jaspers, we show who we are when philosophizing produces effects in our private and public lives, when our actions in the world indirectly illuminate the hidden forces and motives that drive us in our choices and decisions. Philosophizing must accept the fact of science and the existential drives behind the pursuit of scientific knowledge. Although philosophy is not a science in that it has no object, philosophical clarity is gained when objects and objective concepts become ciphers of transcendence. Philosophical consciousness can thus put science to use for the sake of transcendence toward the inner grounds of being, which are never satisfied nor directly presented in worldly (scientific) knowledge.

For Jaspers, transcending is the enactment of philosophizing, just as formal indication is the path of thinking for Heidegger. However, the movement of transcendence does not destruct concealing interpretations of being such that the immediacy of being is revealed to us. It is a dissolution of objectivity that transforms objective concepts into indications and ciphers for what lies beyond them in the inwardness of consciousness. As Jaspers insists, there is no clarity in philosophy without the precision of science. For language to allow communication between and among Existenzen, it must always speak objectively. The only way for language to speak to the inwardness of existential consciousness is to use the objective categories and meanings that are shared by consciousness-in-general. Thus, without objective meaning, philosophy loses the anchor of intelligibility and language loses the power to say anything at all, if only indirectly by means of transcendence-in-dissolution.

The purpose of philosophical communication in Existenzphilosophie is to prompt the other to enact transcendence by directing his consciousness toward his own inner grounds and motives, which in turn must be

illuminated through his actions and decisions in the world, including his relationships with others who philosophize. As Jaspers says, "The philosophizing of contemporaries shows how fellows in existence help themselves." There is no doubt that Jaspers was seeking just this sort of interlocutor in Heidegger and that his subsequent disappointment with Heidegger, aside from the all-toohuman factors on both sides, has its root in what he takes to be Heidegger's deepest philosophical failing: noncommunication.

For Heidegger what is at issue in formal indication is not the inwardness of existential transcendence, but the ontological moment in which being shows itself in a flash of unconcealment. For Jaspers, Heidegger's fascination with the facticity of the Sache, which bursts forth in sudden revelations and striking uncanniness, and whose ultimate indication is silence, is the antithesis of philosophical communication between Existenzen. This same fascination, one may surmise, lies behind Heidegger's 1933 Rectoral Address, which marks the turning point in his friendship with Jaspers and which puts into question the meaning of his philosophizing insofar as it is concretely enacted in his historical decisions.

Those who are taken with this question of Heidegger's political involvements will find much to consider in the present volume. In addition to the pertinent letters concerning the events of 1933, the editors have provided supplementary materials, including passages from Jaspers's Philosophische Autobiographie and his letter to the Freiburg Denazification Committee regarding the disposition of Heidegger's case. One will see in these texts Jaspers's unreserved critique of Heidegger's actions, personal and philosophical, but also his lasting sense that Heidegger and his thinking cannot simply be dismissed on the basis of historical "facts." Indeed, to do so would be an abdication of the philosophical imperative to get to the root of things, especially if such a dismissal is offered as an already accomplished coming-to-terms with the core of Heidegger's philosophizing. A coming-to-terms with this matter still lies ahead of us.

I make these remarks in the spirit of clarification. They are, of course, not to be taken as a summary of the Heidegger Jaspers correspondence or as an

authoritative interpretation. I offer this translation as a stimulus to further philosophizing, whose course cannot be foreseen.

Unless otherwise noted, the translations of the materials included in the present volume are my own. The translation of Heidegger's rendering of the chorus from Antigone (see Letter 120) can be compared with the English version by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt in their translation of Introduction to Metaphysics [see the bibliography]. I have retranslated this piece to reflect the differences in Heidegger's German rendering in his letter to Jaspers. Although the letter from Jaspers to the Freiburg Denazification Committee (see the Appendix) has appeared in an English translation by Richard Wolin (see The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader [New York: Columbia University Press, 19911 pp. 144-51). I have retranslated it in its entirety. I leave it to those who can read the German with sufficient understanding to judge the difference.

I have left the organization of the text as it was arranged by Walter Biemel and Hans Saner, with two exceptions: For easier reference, I have removed Jaspers's letter to the denazification committee from the notes and attached it as a separate appendix; I have also attached a bibliography of the works by Heidegger and Jaspers that are referred to by the editors in their annotations.

Finally, I would like to thank Prof. Hugh J. Silverman and Prof. Graeme Nicholson for their encouragement and patience during the completion of this project. Thanks are due, as well, to the editorial staff at Humanity Books for their friendly cooperation and support.

Gary E. Aylesworth

Eastern Illinois University

EDITORS' REMARKS

Jaspers and Heidegger corresponded with one another from 1920 to 1963. Altogether, 155 pieces of writing have been preserved. An additional fifteen confirmable letters from Jaspers to Heidegger, of which there are no copies found among Jaspers's papers, must be considered lost. Furthermore, among these papers there are letters to Heidegger marked "not sent." Because they were not removed by Jaspers from his correspondence, and because they are filed in chronological order, we have printed them in this text with a note indicating that they remained unsent; however, because Heidegger could not have had knowledge of them, they have been set in a different typeface.

The correspondence was sporadic between 1936 and 1949. In Jaspers's papers, the last letter to Heidegger from this time, dated May 16, 1936, exists in outline; because this letter is missing from Heidegger's papers, it is possible that he did not receive it, which could have led to the interruption in the correspondence. However, after this there followed an exchange of writings: from Jaspers to Heidegger until 1938, and from Heidegger to Jaspers also during the war. Mutual notes of thanks or other such communications, however, have not been found.

The letters have been reproduced without abridgements or omissions. Occasional abbreviations have been spelled out, the orthography has been modernized, and obvious errors have been silently corrected.

The editors have agreed to forgo interpretation. They have divided the editorial responsibilities as follows: Walter Biemel for the letters from Heidegger to Jaspers and the corresponding annotations; and Hans Saner for the letters from Jaspers to Heidegger and the materials pertaining to them. The edition is the result of a commission by Dr. Herman Heidegger and the Karl Jaspers Stiftung in Basel, who separately laid down the editorial principles for their representatives.

Walter Biemel would like to thank Stefan Winter, M.A., for his assistance in transcribing Heidegger's letters and in proofreading; Hermine Biemel for collating the manuscript; and Dr. Herman Heidegger for his help in identifying named persons and for his advice. Likewise, he would like to thank Mr. Mark Michalski for verifying the bibliographical information. Hans Saner would like to thank Mr. Marc Hanggi for his scholarly assistance, and Ms. Dana Hochhuth and Ms. Liselotte Muller for their technical assistance. Both editors extend their thanks to the Archiv fur deutsche Literatur in Marbach for the friendly assistance they were always granted.

The Karl Jaspers-Stiftung expresses its thanks to the University of Heidelberg for its help with editorial tasks and to the following institutions for their financial support: the Schweizerischen Nation- alfonds zur Forderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, Bern; the Max Geldner-Stiftung, Basel; the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn; and the Stiftung Niedersachsen, Hannover.

Aachen and Basel, February 1989

The Editors

THE CORRESPONDENCE

1. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Most Esteemed Professor!

Now that I have my burdensome Spengler lectures behind me, I am finally able to write.' I had already left early that morning' because I didn't want to use the express train and, besides, I would have arrived here at one o'clock in the morning. If I can find time during my return trip, I will let you know in advance. I very much enjoyed the evening I spent with you and had, above all, the feeling that we are working at revitalizing philosophy from the same fundamental situation. From Gottingen, I am offered the prospect of more time for my talk,3 so I am also thinking of a detailed summary.

I thank you and your wife for the cordial reception and send you both my compliments.

Yours very truly

Martin Heidegger

Wiesbaden, April 21, 1920

Kaiser Friederich-Ring 54

2. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, January 21, 1921

Most Honored Colleague!

May I ask you to do me the kindness of telling me your opinion of the philosophical doctoral work and the philosophical personality of Herr Friedrich Neumann?1 This person, for local reasons, would like to take his doctoral degree with me in Heidelberg. In principle, I am pleased and willing to do this; however, I have already turned away many gentlemen because I only want to take on a first-rate project, and I don't want to assist the less deserving in acquiring a philosophical doctorate from a German university. Your judgment would be very important to me as, from what I hear, you have known this gentleman for a long time, and his work has been produced within the range of your own ideas.

Why are you unable to realize the doctorate yourself?

Please excuse this naked inquiry. I know from our singular dis- cussion2 that, in these matters, you and I are in complete agreement about standards.

With best wishes

Yours truly

K. Jaspers

Handschuhsheimerlandstr. 38

3. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, Lerchenstr. 8, January 22, 1921

Most Esteemed Professor!

I will gladly give you the particulars, if only so that it doesn't look like I want to push Herr Fr. Neumann' off on you.

Herr N. is here for the second semester. I wouldn't want to say that I know him, which with him isn't so easy-not as if he has a highly complicated nature, but because he is entirely unstable, careless, and perhaps a sham in everything.

When he arrived during the summer, he was entirely enthused with Husserl:Z Every triviality was a revelation, every verbal formulation classic. He read manuscripts for Husserl, copied them down, and was inseparable from him. He also planned a work in the philosophy of language. At the beginning of this semester, something must have happened between them. Husserl is now radically rejected, and critical remarks by me are taken in a boyishly onesided way. And in all of this, almost nothing is understood. He has a certain circle of mediocre people who talk nonsense to each other and who have attempted to attach themselves to me, but to no avail. They believe they can succeed by jabbering back sentences taken from my lectures, but they do not notice how sharply I keep them in check. They are in my beginners' seminar on Descartes' Meditations-up to now it has dealt only with basic interpretation, solid work-and every other one of them fails every time. They believe themselves to be exempt from serious work and blather nonsensethe first and second semesters go more simply and directly to the point.

As in the last semester with Husserl, he swears by my lectures, which he has not understood (I admit that the imperfection of the instruction, above all in the presentation, has contributed to this). This is shown in the outline of a project on "the value of life," which N. submitted to me before

Christmas vacation. He had asked me before how he should arrange things in order to graduate as soon as possible (he is in his eighth semester-what he did in Vienna has not been made clear to me).

He doesn't want to work with Husserl. I told him that I couldn't personally be an examiner but, at most, I could only provide a written appraisal of his work, so he would still be delivered over to Husserl in the end. At this, he said that perhaps he would go to you, as he wants to take his degree in Germany and indeed very quickly (apparently for financial reasons). I told him that I would recom mend his case to you if I could represent it with a good conscience. During the vacation, I perused the outline, which is unsystematic and written in a matter of weeks, and, in reply to his urgent request, I sent my verdict to him in Vienna.

I made it clear to him that it couldn't go like this and that there are two paths open to him: to either orient his research on Dilthey,3 that is, actually work his way through Dilthey, which would last well into the summer, or take up the work systematically, which cannot be accomplished in any foreseeable time.

I pointed out the grossest misunderstandings in my comments. When he returned, he declared that he would like to take the first path. Herr Scheyer,4 whom he has now closely befriended, and whom he had ridiculed as an idiot during the summer, has suggested to him that he might send you something concerning the project. He wanted to send you the same thing he had submitted to me. I told him that it would he pointless, because he already had my judgment on the matter.

I don't know what he is doing now. I told him up front, as soon as he mentioned your name, that he shouldn't imagine that the thing would be easy, and I thought precisely about my conversations with you. In my opinion, the case is simple: If the work doesn't satisfy me, I will reject it outright and tell him that it is pointless to attempt it with you. If he should try this nevertheless, you would have to take the trouble of rejecting it. I have already thrown out four people this semester. Formally, I am only

hanging on to one for the time being. That is Herr L6with.5 What he will do and how he will do it, I don't know.

Yesterday, Afra Geiger6 came to see me. She introduced the matter to Finkel this way: Philosophy is too difficult, and now she wants to try history. Honest and direct, to be sure-but for Geheimrat Finke, shocking. Now she wants to know if she might do a project in the history of philosophy-in the medieval period. I told her that it would be impossible to make her way through this in a year, since she has no theological preparation (that's the fundamental condition and the main issue) and she doesn't know Aristotle or Augustine. I feel very sorry for her, and I will speak to Finke one more time. I have lost all of my optimism about today's students, both male and female. Even the better of them are either religious enthusiasts (theosophists who have also established themselves in protestant theology), followers of George and the like, or they fall into an unhealthy eclecticism, where they know nothing about everything and everything about nothing.

They lack a genuine understanding of scholarly work and a real power of perseverance, of sacrifice, of true initiative. But in the end, exaggerated criticism is also a handicap. I suffer from this because people awaken false expectations in me with every apparently positive remark. No one under forty should take the podium.

I must once again undertake the review of your books during the vacation-perhaps it will be the worse for this.

With sincere greetings

Yours very truly

Martin Heidegger

Please send my regards to your wife.

4. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, January 24, 1921

Most Honored Colleague!

I thank you very much for your detailed and vivid letter. Always the same distressing content!

As to Herr Neumann, I am naturally very grateful to you for sparing me unnecessary work through your own judgment. At the same time as my first letter to you, I wrote to Herr Neumann, who wanted to come here. I told him that it wouldn't be necessary to come in person, and that it would be preferable to me if he would send me his work when he considered it sufficiently complete.

I am also very sorry about Afra Geiger. I hoped that she would undertake a project in a specific subject that she can complete with hard work. Her motivation with Finke is honest but stupid. Hopefully, however, she can still do something with him. Of course, a study in the history of philosophy would bring the same difficulties as before. I completely affirm her work as a university student, because something essential was alive in it-but for her, the doctoral title is a purely practical, bourgeois matter (as indeed it is for the majority of students). She is very clear that that is fine and, in a particular science, there is completely solid workmanship to be done in simply working up materials according to a given problem. The only thing needed for this is the good will of an appropriate professor.

Your review of my Weltanschauungs-Psychologiel is the only one I am eager to see.

Thank you once again!

With sincere greetings

Very truly yours

Karl Jaspers

My wife sends her best regards.

5. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Dear Herr Professor!

The transcribing of the manuscript' was drawn out because I was dependent upon the kindness of a student who wrote only for a few hours a week and, thus, took a long time. The whole thing is very compressed and heavy, but, from much of it, it will be clear as to where I want to go from here. The style is more Greek than German because, at the time of the revision, and even now, I read Greek almost exclusively.

Since only four volumes of the Gottinger Anzeigen, instead of twelve, will appear annually, the number of pages at my disposal has been reduced to one-third. Whether the manuscript will ever be printed or not, I don't know. I still have two carbon copies. I will send one to Rickert,2 since I once promised him the review, and Husserl will get the other. I have thought once again about the planned deletions and decided that it would be best to omit them, although the diction will be somewhat more dense. It is indeed a strange thing to give instructions as to style.

In the winter, I want to lecture on Aristotle's metaphysics. Perhaps in doing this I will be able to elicit all kinds of things-3

In any case, I only have a few students with whom I can do anything intelligent in the lessons.

My wife4 and I send sincere congratulations on your offers of appointment.5

With best wishes from our house to yours,

Very truly yours

Martin Heidegger

Freiburg, June 25, 1921

6. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, June 28, 1921

Dear Herr Heidegger!

Many thanks. I still can't tell you anything today, because I can't yet study your work;' however, I want at least to acknowledge its reception. I am hoping to gain an important impulse from studying it.

The second edition of my Weltanschauung--Psychologie, for which the publisher2 has been pressing me for a long time, should actually not be revised. When I have something new to say, I will write a new book. So I will limit myself to stylistic polishing and better grouping, and I will leave the spirit of the book as it is. The book is truly not perfect but can only be revised with difficulty for, in the end, I love it the way it is and, in each of its failings, I believe the intention will be visible and that studying it as it is can be instructive.

Thus I will read your critique more with a view to future work than as something to he utilized immediately. Of course, this isn't final. It is only my momentary attitude toward preparing the second edition.

Please give my regards to your dear wife, and accept

sincere greetings from your

Karl Jaspers

One more remark: Do you really want to address me with the title Professor when we have long since begun a philosophical relationship? Or do you trust me so little?

7. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, August 1, 1921

Dear Herr Heidegger!

Afra Geiger told me that you would understandably like to know how things are being arranged for someone to succeed me in the Extraordinariat' I now hold. I would very much like to have you here, as you know, but, unfortunately, the sitiuation is such that your prospects are as good as none. Even Kroner2 has no prospects. I can't tell you any details yet, and I ask that you treat this as confidential.

Hopefully, you are serious about visiting us in the fall, as Afra Geiger informed us, for I would also like to speak with you about your critique,3 which I have now closely read. A good discussion is indeed the most effective and most penetrating form when one wants to come into a relationship concerning such things. For now, only a couple of entirely preliminary remarks:

In my opinion, your review is, of all of those I have read, the one that digs deepest to the roots of the ideas. It has, therefore, really touched me from within.4 However, I still miss-even in the discussions of I am and "historical"5-the positive method. I constantly detected in the reading the power to move forward but was then disappointed to have found myself already come so far, for the mere program impresses me as little as it does you. I found several judgments to be in error. Nonetheless, I will postpone all of this until we can speak in person. I grasp more in question and answer than in lecturing, but no one among the younger philosophers interests me more than you. Your critique can do me some good. It has already done me some good, because it makes me really think and allows no rest.

May I keep your manuscript?

Sincere greetings to your wife, also from mine.

Yours, Karl Jaspers

Afra Geiger wrote to us today from the Matterhorn.

8 MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Mei kirch, August 5, 1921

Dear Herr Jaspers!

I thank you sincerely for both of your letters. I didn't answer the first one because I didn't have anything to write, and in the last few weeks I was overworked. The entire semester was a disappointment for me; those who sit before me are not worth the effort. One or another gets to work on occasion, but only to fall again into a comfortable dilettantism. I often asked myself during the past semester what we are actually doing. I am not out for teaching success and the like. Insofar as we do not finally exclude all aims in that direction, we can only justify our activity at the university by taking it completely seriously for ourselves, by grabbing hold of our supposed duties and taking them a step further.

In doing this, we only risk the chance that no one will go along with us in our business, but that is one of the best and most reliable tests as to whether we are really getting down to work-and if this exhausts us, the proof is delivered, but we discover in ourselves again and again the creature who wants to comfortably slip away from difficulties and build houses of cards for itself.

You may keep the critique. A back-and-forth with letters won't accomplish much. It is not certain whether I will come to Heidelberg during the vacation. I am making such slow progress in my work that the vacation will have to be spent preparing my next lecture. I've been at home the entire time, from the sixteenth of the month until now. That I have done you many injustices, Husserl also says. For me, that is only proof that I have at least tried to throw myself into it. The point is made if you get some kind of stimulus out of it, perhaps one that I didn't even intend. Judged by the standards I hold for my work, it's a laughable, pitiful, beginner's attempt, and I don't imagine myself to have gone further than you, especially since I have it in my head to make a few detours. Whether I can also find my way

into the clear, or whether I go only so far and stop, or even go at all, I don't know.

As to the hopelessness regarding the Heidelberg Extraordinariat,' I was properly informed through a hint in a letter from Afra Geiger to Lowith. I have no inclination to chase after appointments-but because the first possibility for me opened in Heidelberg, I was understandably interested. Above all, I would have been very glad for my work, which would have been more free and uninhibited. So I continue to live under internal and external pressure, but I have the one important benefit: I don't have to direct my work according to official regulations but follow my own requirements.

After my departure from Freiburg, it seems that rumors were circulated there, as Dr. Mannheim' in Heidelberg has told me, according to which I "would most certainly be given a prospect." When I heard about it here at home, I clung to it, but now that I have a report from you yourself, the matter is settled for me. I am telling you this in order to make it clear to you that apparent indiscretions (or maneuvers?) may have emanated from others.

I am happy that you have settled everything so agreeably and that it won't be necessary to allow yourself to be transplanted.

Now you can really get going.

Sincere greetings from house to house,

Yours truly

Martin Heidegger

9. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., June 27, 1922

Dear Herr Jaspers!

I thank you warmly for the friendly gesture of sending me your writing.' My answer was delayed because I collapsed during the Whitsun holidays and can only now resume working.

I must admit from the beginning that I know nothing of Strindberg and have never seen an original van Gogh. I am, however, familiar with his letters. Your philosophical and scholarly attitude comes even more to expression in this piece, especially after the page where you try, in a positive way, to understand physical causality in the old sense, from within the spiritual-historical world.

This task has the following question as its foundation: How can these spheres, (e.g., of the schizophrenic), be fit into a permeation of life that is unifying in principle and conceptually categorical, according to the meaning of its being and objectivity; thus, the question is still put in the old way. The relevant objectivity should precisely not be grasped as a sphere, or region with an indeterminate character of being. The objective and thematic character that these phenomena have had from the scientific approach hitherto must be given up, and the conceptually categorical meaning must be provided for them, that they have insofar as they are something, as they are such agitations by way of a fundamental meaning of the facticity (formally: the meaning of the being) of life. It must be made clear as to what it means to make up human Dasein, to participate in it, but that means that the meanining of the being of life and of being human must be won originarily and determined categorically. The psychical is not something that the human has consciously or unconsciously, but something that he is and that lives in him. That means principally: There are objects that we do not have but are, indeed there are those whose what rests in their that they are. More specifically, the old ontological separation between what

something is, and that something is, is not only insufficient in content but also has an origin within whose field of meaning an experience of the being of life (in short, the historical) and its sense of being is not available today.

The old ontology (and the structures of categories that have grown out of it) must be rebuilt from the ground up-if this is taken seriously, it means grasping and directing one's own present life in its basic intentions. Our philosophy is not to be understood as having accomplished more than what the Greeks, for their part, accomplished for themselves, not to speak, then, of our having a clue as to what it would mean to accomplish the same thing for ourselves, and only this. That does not mean, however, to renew Plato or Aristotle, or to be enthralled with classical antiquity, and to preach that the Greeks already knew everything important.

What is needed is a critique of all ontology hitherto, with its roots in Greek philosophy, especially in Aristotle, whose ontology (even this concept doesn't fit) lives as strongly in Kant and Hegel as in any medieval scholastic.

This critique needs, moreover, a principal understanding of the thematic problems of the Greeks from the motives and the attitude of their way of access to the world, from their ways of addressing objects, and their ways, in so doing, of carrying out the formation of concepts.

To concretely and cleanly fulfill this task-solely as a pretask- indeed, merely to bring it to the basis of a clear formulation, requires a lot of work. When we earnestly, constantly, and livingly pursue this in respect to the question of the explication of the meaning of the being of life, as the object that we are, and with this every intimacy and every care-every agitation as caring in the broadest sense, then, out of inner respect for the object with which we go around philosophizing-we keep ourselves from saying something just to get published.

Either we are serious with philosophy and its possibilities as a principal kind of scientific research, or we understand ourselves as scientific persons

of the worst deficiency-in that we babble on and on in worn-out concepts and half-clear intentions, and we work only as required.

Should we grasp the first alternative, then we have chosen the danger of risking our entire external and internal existence for something whose success and result we are not able to see.

I have made it clear to myself without sentimentality that the decision in favor of this alternative comes into question only for the philosopher as a scientific investigator. There are things about which we do not speak and, in a pronouncement like this, only indicate. If it doesn't succeed in awakening such consciousness positively and concretely in the youth, then all talk about the crisis of science and the like is still just talk. If it is not clear to us that we must live out such matters-in first developing them-in front of the youth, then we have no right to live in scientific research.

In connection with the task of winning the original categorical structure of the object life, I saw the pricipal meaning of the investigations in which you want to fit the schizophrenic and the like into the meaning of the being of life.

In this concrete way, we will be able to make transparent the impossibilities that lie in an isolated, free-floating problem of consciousness.

We cannot post festum introduce evil reality and stick spiritual acts onto a body (even the Negroes do not have such representations of Dasein as those that circulate in today's scientific philosophy). Today, however, in philosophy everything stands on its head. It is taken as unrefined when we ask a thinker about his principal position, and we are reduced to criticizing trivialities to our heart's content. To the best of my knowledge, it was the other way around during the time of Plato and Aristotle. As long as we are not resolved to place ourselves with our products into this basis of struggle in a principal confrontation at knifepoint, we remain outside of science. To be sure, we will have a fine livelihood, and we will make fools of several

dozen people every semester solely through the indifference with which we treat our principles and uproot our acts of knowledge.

Your work has made it clearer to me that in the critique of the psychology of worldviews, your investigations are set in the right positive direction toward the problem, and that strengthens in me the consciousness of a rare and independent comradeship in arms that I otherwise-not even today-do not find anywhere.

I only wish that, without prejudicing objectivity, you would attack the matter more sharply. It truly isn't necessary for you to be overcautious.

I also see more and more clearly that the critique of the psychology of worldviews is insufficient-still not positive enough. I have indeed expanded on this, deleted many things and written them anew. I want to publish them in a new form, if possible, in parallel with the "Interpretations of Aristotle," whose printing in the Jahrbuch will begin in the fall.' What is decisive for me is the fear that your book will indeed he much read and profitably utilized, but that precisely its proper, philosophical, and principal effective possibility will neither be seen nor understood in today's philosophical babbling. Will the second edition come next?

Because, under the current circumstances, even a shorter trip is out of the question, I will not be able to visit you, but I hope that perhaps next time you will again come to see me.

Sincere greetings from house to house

Yours

Martin Heidegger

10. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 2, 1922

Dear Herr Heidegger!

Thank you very much for your letter! I especially thank you for your friendly sentiments and for your consciousness of a comradeshipin-arms in all of your careful attacks and jabs, which gives me pleasure. I wish even more that we could just once have a thorough discussion with one another, but perhaps that will happen in the not-too-distant future.

I am very happy that there is the prospect of an interpretation of Aristotle from you (a Freiberg student already told me about this recently)-not only because I would like to read something new from you, but also because not only the inner, but also the outer, destiny of what we are talking about depends upon such publications-from you above all, since you already hold strong personal credit with many, and they only wait for something to come of it. We have already spoken before about this and everthing that can be said about it ethically and sociologically.

That you want to publish the critique of my book is very valuable to me. It is indeed the only critique that I have been interested in-and if you have also gone further in pursuing a positive moment in my work, this can naturally only please me.

Your critique has not yet made itself felt in the new edition of my book. I have only changed things that are entirely inessential and left the book as it is. Insofar as I have gone further, I cannot change this book-it is possible in the Psychopathology'-but I must write another. I am already at work on it, but I am giving myself a lot of time, since the plan and the demand are downright large. Whether I can do it at all still remains to be seen.'

The longer I am at it, the more firm my position on university-philosophy becomes. It is a waste of time to concern ourselves much with

it, as long as we have not forced our way through the really great philosophers and the spirit of the age until our powers are exhausted. It already seemed to me before-I believe I told you so-that you stand more in a discussing relationship with Neokantianism, etc., than I, while I don't want to get caught in this net. I only have the impulse toward a great and total break-what do these philosophy professors have on their conscience!-but I put this aside, for one thing, because I am not completely free of guilt myself and still struggle over the proper way to claim to be a professor of philosophy, because one's own positive accomplishment must he there first, before one starts adding things up. Perhaps it will go with me as it did in psychiatry. There, I wanted to begin with a critique of Kraepelin,3 but I transferred it into my Psychopathology and, as I completed this, the critique was no longer worthwhile, since it was already there implicitly.

Above all things, we must not allow ourselves to be disturbed in the pure development of our own impulse by anti feelings, by rejection and hate. I tend to do this and, therefore, do not allow any rage to develop in me by ignoring any possible object of rage.

I am conscious of the enormous presumption of this position, and I only write this to you because you are in the same situation. Externally, gentleness and calmness is the form in which we retain the greatest freedom for our thinking. Should a fight be necessary at some point, then it should indeed he a fight, but I'm not going to fritter myself away ahead of time.

To be sure, I would like to let go of all reserve in my discussions with you, because I also believe that we find ourselves at the same level: you perhaps more consciously and critically, I more clumsily and gropingly.

I don't want to go into the philosophical content of your letter in writing. Not everything is clear to me, and what I would like to say about it, at times aggressively, can only be made intelligible in a spoken exchange. I am still hopeful of an opportunity in the fall.

Sincere greetings, also to your wife

Your Karl Jaspers

11. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, September 6, 1922

Dear Herr Heidegger!

Now I dare to speak once again about your visit in Heidelberg and invite you once again to stay with us. I must repeat, however, that it is somewhat primitive (bed made on the chaise lounge in the study, washing in the lavatory-it can't be otherwise in our narrow apartment). It would indeed be wonderful if we could just philosophize for a few days during suitable hours to try out and solidify the comradeship-in-arms. I have in mind that we live together-each with a room for ourselves, because my wife has gone away. Each of us will do what we want and, excepting meal times, we will meet together as we wish, and talk, especially in the evenings or however else it works out, without being forced. If you are willing and able to do this, please come very soon-and announce yourself as soon as you arrive. My wife returns on the fourteenth of September, and then I would rather be alone again. Of course, in view of the current extreme situation we are both living in, I will be responsible for the travel expenses. I assume there is no need to discuss this. I am enclosing a note (1,000 Marks) for the trip.

Sincere greetings to your wife and to you

Your Karl Jaspers

You will soon receive the second edition of my Psychology of Worldviews from the publisher. You need only place the copy in your library, for it is not considerably changed-only a few things deleted and a few things polished up stylistically.

12. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., November 19, 1922

Dear Herr Jaspers!

The eight days spent with you are continually with me. The suddenness of these days, which was externally uneventful, the sureness of style in which each day unaffectedly grew into the next, the unsentimental, austere step with which friendship came upon us, the growing certainty from both sides of a mutually secure comradeship-in-arms-all of that is uncanny for me in the same sense as the world and life are uncanny for the philosopher.

I sincerely thank you again for those days.

When I came back here, Husserl was waiting for me with the news that they had information about my Aristotle lectures, and so on, in Marburg; Natorp' would like a concrete orientation concerning my planned projects. I worked on this for three weeks, exerpting myself and writing an introduction; I then dictated the entire thing (60 pages) and had Husserl send a copy each to Marburg and Gottingen.

You can see the success in Gottingen from the enclosed letter from Misch.z Certainly, nothing is going to jump out of this for me, as I am even less well known by governments than I am by faculties. The necessary business trips are not in my line.

The work was also a success in Marburg. Natorp writes that, in addition to three others, I will most certainly be put in a prominent place on the list; presumably, that is the famous second place. Kroner, who was apparently already talked about last semester, will then, no doubt, stand in first place-he is the older one and, above all, he has a lot of paper.3

For myself, I would have to feel that such a ranking is a disgrace but, above all, I want peace for myself-one way or another. This being led on

with half-prospects, bungling with recommendations, etc., brings you into a terrible state, even when you make up your mind not to get caught up in it.

This semester I am only giving two lessons, one for beginners and the other on Aristotle.' However, the people have no initiative and no reliability in their work. For the time being, they can only be brought as far as not thinking in phrases or going in for flimflam. For most of them, this is already enough.

Lowith has evidently made things easier for himself. The work is supposed to be turned in via Geiger.5 Since I was given nothing to see of the revision that was demanded, I have renounced all responsibility.

After completing my synopsis, I had several more beautiful days of sun with my wife and children at the cabin.6 I energetically gathered wood and laid it in for the winter.

I am sending you herewith Max Scheler's essay.7

In my Aristotle lessons,' I have a living, breathing Jesuit who expressly delivered greetings to me from my former acquaintances.

Please send the letter from Misch back to me at your convenience. The stuff about appointments is naturally confidential, as always.

With sincere greetings from house
to house,

Your thankful

Martin Heidegger

13. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, November 24, 1922

Dear Heidegger!

My sincere thanks! You know how much our stay together also meant to me and what hopes I have for the future. In the philosophical dreariness of the times, it is splendid when we live to see that we may have trust. And neither of us, ourselves, knows what we want; viz. we are both borne up by a knowing that is not yet explicit. What might come of it! In repeatedly thinking about those days, I interpreted your earlier remark about needing a truly critical journal to mean that the two of us must try this: The Philosophy of the Age, Critical Writings by Marlin HeideggerandKarlJaspers.' Only the two of us will write these, and they will appear in occasional volumes. We will only begin when both of us have completed a sufficient number of essays. We will let it go when we are finished or don't want to do it any longer. It will deal with the actual philosophy of the age: every feature of philosophical and antiphilosophical attitudes of life. The philosophy professors make up only one object among others. Short essays, clear and decisive. Science will be in the background, as a basis, but not explicitly presented as a method. We must also deal with people like Max Weber2 and Rathenau3 (the and does not horrify me).4 We will not revile, but the discussion will be no-holds-barred-therefore, it will happen only when you get a position; however, I am already enjoying it in my imagination, for I believe, without knowing it, that you also want to do this.

That you find being led on by possible appointments hard to bear is something I understand all too well, since I experienced it myself for two years, though not, to be sure, in today's much more difficult circumstances. That your projects were well received in Gottingen and Marburg makes me happy in spite of everything. Unfortunately, I also share with you great skepticism in regard to the final result, but I still have a little hope

nonetheless. You are on both lists, and hopefully no one else is. The government (in which I know Wende5 and Becker6) makes decisions with mistrust toward the faculties and draws upon all possible findings. The old racketeering by schoolmasters is over; nevertheless, you make it right difficult for these people and, ultimately, we cannot expect everyone to see who you are. Misch's letter pleases me. He is very guileless; indeed, he doesn't have a clue, but he has obviously written an excellent evaluation of you and, for this, he deserves praise.

I have zipped through the Scheler piece-I thank you sincerely for sending it to me. There are many judgments that I have nearly agreed with in my historical lectures.' He sees many things correctly but, in general, he seems superficial to me-not in the technique of the work, which means nothing, but in living. He ignores differences of level. He ultimately stirs everything together into one broth. While doing this, he formulates several times and, I believe, spot-on, tasks that are currently pressing. At least one reads it. That is a lot, for I read most philosophers of this time only when I must.

Thanks as well for the Overbeck volume.8 You bought it for me. How much do I owe you? I read it immediately-with much sympathy but, at the end, with the same mistrust with which I read him before. A thin, bloodless sort, with much discretion but only as a shield-without any impulse for me-nevertheless, an honest man, of proven faithfulness in his friendship with Nietzsche and an unimpeachable scholar. This is all very fine but, when we read philosophical dicta, we apply another standard of measure. He is altogether striking in his critique, to be sure. We, or at least I, see the positive that comes out of the critique so thinly that, for me, it disappears. It is itself simply too negative to describe-but he comes from the world of Nietzsche and Burckhardt and, just because of this, I read him with reverence and with the consciousness of being in one of the few oases of the modern European desert.

With sincere greetings and no less
thankful than you

Your Karl Jaspers

14. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, June 19, 1923

Dear Herr Jaspers!

Yesterday I received the offer from Marburg for the Extraordinariat with the position and privileges of an Ordinarius. Your Psychopathology' came with the same post-a coincidence: I take it as a moving reminder of what must now be done.

Since I have no money for travel and lodging in Berlin, I have begun written negotiations regarding moving costs. Other than this, I have no demands to make-but, because many things may be brought up that I am not thinking about, please give me some brief suggestions from your experience. Since the living arrangements can perhaps be settled quickly, my wife and I will travel to Marburg, and we will use the occasion to stop by to see you.

I am looking forward to studying your book-the nonsense in psychiatry seems to be strongly supported by that in phenomenology. Husserl is enthusiastic about such stuff as is brought into the world by Frl. Walther.2 He has no organ to discern that a shoddy piece of work that contrives to quote Ricarda Huch,3 Kierkegaard, and Hedwig Martius4 all at once, refutes itself. All of this sterile noise is not to be ignored insofar as it makes the positive educational work of young people more difficult at every step. In both of the last two semesters, I had much joy-but it wears one out so much.

I look forward to the peaceful little town and the undisturbed work.

Sincere greetings from house to house.

In loyal friendship

Your Martin Heidegger

Dr. Heidegger Lerchenstr. 8

15. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, June 20, 1923

Dear Heidegger!

Finally the spell is broken! I congratulate you, myself, and your friends. It is good that, for once, something reasonable happens in the world, even without a rule. I only have one small regret in this: What they could do in Marburg we should also have been able to do;' then I could have lived together with you. Perhaps sometime later!

You want suggestions. An important date is the time from which the pension is conferred and calculated. Usually it is the day the Habilitation is completed, but that must nevertheless be expressly stated; otherwise it is legally the date of the budgetary appointment, which is especially important for the widow's pension. (During my appointment negotiations, the phrase was circulated here by Oncken:2 "The only difficulty is always the widow Jaspers.")

In respect to salary, you will hardly be able to make demands. Moving costs are normally completely reimbursed-naturally, with the exception of new purchases. Advance payment of a lump-sum, to give you some money in hand, is usual, and this was also offered to me in Berlin.3

Travel for negotiating purposes, when desired by Berlin, will usually also be reimbursed for all expenses (lodging, meals).

We are looking forward to your visit with your wife. If each of you would be satisfied with a chaise lounge (upon which a bed will be made), we would like to have both of you stay with us. One can stay in my room, the other in my wife's room. We now have somewhat more space (we live at Plock 66, diagonal to the library, the second house from the Peterskirche). The reason we moved was the danger that the electric tram would close down, and I would then have to live close to the university.

There is much to ask and to talk about, thus you are not coming too soon!

Sincerest Greetings

Let us hold fast to our friendship!

Your Karl Jaspers

In case you need money, I can lend you up to a million, which I would get by selling some German bank stock.

Sincere greetings as well to your wife!

After the letter was finished, Curtius4 came by. He congratulates you very sincerely and is visibly happy for your success.

Good-bye and best wishes for independence.

Gertrud Jaspers

16. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, July 14, 1923

Dear Herr Jaspers!

Sincere thanks to you and your wife for your good wishes. The main thing has been settled in writing. However, Richter' would like to meet me. What for, I don't know, but he would like to sanction a duty-trip after his vacation in August. In spite of the three nominations (I was also on a list in Konigsberg) I didn't believe any longer that I would be offered a position-after I became aware of the latest methods for obtaining a professorship.

In Marburg, Kroner was nominated in third place-in January, he went to Berlin and whined all over the place, then he even presented himself in person in Marburg.

I have never seen such wretchedness in a human being-now he allows himself to be pitied like an old woman-the only favor one could do for him now would be to take away his venia legendi. He would have been more agreeable to Hartmann,' since Kroner promised him to his face that, if he were called to Marburg, he would naturally enter into an alliance with him. That I won't do, but I willin the manner of my presence-make hell hot for him. A shock troop of sixteen persons is coming with me. Many are the inevitable fellow travellers, but some are entirely serious and capable.

As you see, I do not intend to become a genteel and cautious professor who is none too particular about his means of subsistence-this is to say, our friendship must now become concretewhich is what I wanted to suggest by the coincidence that your gesture of friendship came in the same post as the appointment offer.

It will soon be a year since those wonderful days I still draw upon-to be sure, I still haven't printed anything, and I simply endure it when I am referred to as he who publishes nothing. The Introduc- tion3 has become a

book-hut the main thing is, I am more certain of myself in true uncertainty, 90 percent of my energy goes into teaching: I am lecturing this semester for one hour4 and have three seminars (six hours). I leave to the world its books and literary goings-on, and fetch myself some young people fetch means to treat them strictly, so that they are under pressure the whole week. Many can't endure it-the easiest kind of selection-many need two or three semesters to understand why I permit them nothing: no laziness, no superficiality, no bunk, no phrases, and, above all, nothing phenomenological. You know that I do not allow any reports-only discussions and, to be sure, not wild ones-I don't allow sudden insights and dialectical playing around-all of which demands preparation, that is, intensive involvement with the matter at hand, which is not half so comfortable as writing book after book. My greatest joy is that I can effect change here by example and that I am now free. Unfortunately, the library and the seminar library in Marburg are very bad.

The concretion of our friendship would indeed have been achieved had I gotten the corresponding position in Heidelbergthe fundamental reconstruction of philosophizing in the universities, (i.e., in and with the sciences) will never be achieved by merely writing books. Whoever still doesn't notice this and leads his psue- doexistence in the humdrum of today's busyness does not know where he stands and, the more organically and concretely and inconspicuously the downfall occurs, the more persistent and certain he becomes. To that end, we need an invisible communitythat is actually already too much and looks like coalition, circle, and alignment. Much preaching must be wiped out (i.e., the various medicine men of today's philosophy must have their dreadful and pitiful handiwork exposed) in their own lifetime, so that they don't believe that God's kingdom has appeared today with them.

You already know that Husserl has been offered an appointment in Berlin.5 He behaves worse than a Privatdozent who mistakes the Ordinariat for eternal bliss. What is happening is shrouded in darkness. To begin with, he sees himself as Praeceptor Germa- niae. Husserl is completely falling to pieces-if the pieces were ever together in the first place, which has lately become more and more questionable to me. He swings back and forth and

talks trivialities, so that it would move one to pity. He lives with the mission of being the founder of phenomenology. No one knows what that is. Who ever is here for a semester knows what is wrong. He begins to perceive that people are no longer going along with him. He believes, naturally, that it is too difficult; naturally, no one understands the mathematics of the ethical (the latest!), even when he has advanced further than Heidegger, about whom he now says: Of course he must immediately give lectures himself and can't visit mine; otherwise, he would have advanced further. This is now supposed to redeem the world in Berlin.

Such a milieu exhausts a person, even when you put yourself completely out of it.

I am still hoping to have a few days with you before beginning in Marburg, and I believe the occasions will now introduce themselves more often. We want to philosophize Socratically.

With a sincere handshake

Your

Martin Heidegger

Friendly greetings to your wife; my wife and the boys are at the cabin.

The question of living arrangements will presumably be easily settled.

I will notify you directly.

17. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, September 2, 1923

Dear Jaspers!

Tomorrow I am going to Lake Starnberg with the oldest boy until the move is completed (the end of September). From there, I go to my hometown for a few days and then to you. I would like to take from the days in Heidelberg a new impetus for Marburg. In the next weeks, I want to work on my lecture'-as soon as I know a precise date, I will notify you immediately. I thank you sincerely for the friendly help you have offered. My trip (to take the children away during the move) is included in the moving expenses-the conditions are very liberal. Thank you very much for The Idea of the University.' I will talk to you about it in person.

Sincere greetings from house
to house

Your Martin Heidegger

Address: C/O Prof. Szilasi3
Feldafing b/Munich

18. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, October 9, 1923

Dear Jaspers!

Unfortunately, I must temporarily call off my visit. Our exchange of living arrangements has become impossible due to a death in the family of a member of the exchange group. We were held back at the beginning until last week. In the meantime my father' has become very ill, so I must go home for a few days-and now the time is pressing for me to show myself in Marburg and to find a room. Not so nice but, for the first semester, perhaps entirely suitable. I hope that I can come by to see you during the Christmas vacation.

I don't need to tell you how much I am looking forward to spending those days with you. What one has to say always comes out incomplete and composed in a letter.

Perhaps it is even better if I bring with me a few new experiences from Marburg, and precisely for what I would like to talk to you about.

My wife will stay here with the boys and rent out. I will also leave my library here, so I will lead a monk's existence again with table, chair, and bed. I would be very happy if you would write to me in Marburg, and I will certainly have time to answer.

Sincerest greetings from house to house

Your Martin Heidegger

19. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, November 4, 1923 [Postmark]

Dear Heidegger!

I was somewhat disappointed not to have seen you at all. It was verbally postponed so often that now, in part, it flows into the stream of forgetting. I had questions about the nuances of many passages in your first letter after your appointment-and this would have immediately resulted in an important philosophical disscussion. I am even more reluctant now than I was then to start this in writing, especially my university idea, even though in attitude and style, in level and range of my worldview psychology, it includes many passages that could be taken as letters to you. Now I am hopeful for next time. Since you neither write nor publish, the thread is too thin-except when you are present in person and can speak and answer.' I wish you a good semester and fruitful work-everything material that I would have to say remaining silent for the time being.

Most sincerely Your Karl Jaspers

20. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, April 17, 1924

Schwanallee 21

My Dear Jaspers!

We have apparently philosophized less than we did when we were together earlier, but it is a distortion to compare such situations and even more to estimate them according to gains and losses. Since that September 23, I have continued to live, with you, under the assumption that you are my friend. That is the all-sustaining faith in love.

An inherited reserve and awkwardness may not make it easy for you to be the thou, but that you could do this-i.e., have faith-that you might expressly experience this, was for me the most glorious thing from those days.

I live alone-living with my wife and children is an entirely different positive possibility. But as a man who is, in any case, disposed to fight, friendship is the highest possibility that another can bestow.

My talk about comradeship-in-arms was written from my loneliness. Along with this, I was thinking about coming to terms with the present; however, precisely since those days, I have become more and more unpolemical-not in the sense of not disputing anything, but from a growing understanding that what is decisive is correctly directed, positive work-and you have awakened this in me.

I especially thank you for the last Heidelberg days-I have taken them with me into my study, and they will go with me into the semester.

Do you want to send me your Kant lecture' after the vacation? You will get it back directly. I have read your Idea of the University once again. At

some point, I must declare myself to be in solidarity with it, but I am not yet far enough along.

I thank your wife for the sympathetic hospitality.

With a true handshake and greetings

Your Martin Heidegger

I have just raised the correct amount.

21. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, May 2, 1924

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter.' Two things, in haste:

My father has suffered a stroke and will, presumably, not live much longer. In case I cannot complete my return trip from Mef3kirch in one day, I would like to stay overnight with you. The chaise lounge in your room will suffice if needed.

Second: Marseille,' the friend of Lowith, wants me to ask you if you would be disposed to look at the handwriting of his (sick) mother. He is very concerned about her and has great trust in you. Perhaps you could reply quickly.

Sincere greetings

Your Martin Heidegger

Sincere3 greetings to your wife

22. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg a./L., June 18, 1924

Dear Jaspers!

Yesterday a Japanese who has been working with me for a long time came to me and asked-officially comissioned-if I would be inclined to go to Japan for three years.

In Tokyo, an institute has been founded by Japanese nobility and high finance for the study of European culture, with special consideration for the human sciences. The assignment: to give one weekly lecture or seminar and to assist with a quarterly journal. The Institute is supported by the government and, at the same time, wants to work toward a European understanding. The government will also extend the right to hold lectures at the University of Tokyo, where, at the moment, the history of philosophy is left empty.

Annual salary: 10,000 yen (17,000 Marks). Free relocation with family. If I should ever decide to go, it would only be after making thorough inquiries and after I have finished my work on Aristotle. The advantages would be broadening of horizon, possibility of undisturbed work, and money to build a house upon return. In spite of this, I am not certain whether I need such an excursion or whether I should undertake it.

I honestly had nothing to do with bringing all of this about. My wife would have the greatest amusement: the corresponding pleasure in the undertaking.

1. Do you have some advice for me?

2. If I shouldn't go, may I nominate you? The gentleman referred to holds the matter in his hands, so to speak.

What happens in such a case regarding official duties? Is there a vacation at all? How does it work with Lederer?'

Whom would you recommend?

A certain Herr HeiL is studying with me here.' Are you more closely acquainted with him? It's magnificent outside, nothing is happening at the university, passing the time away, middling average, no excitement, no stimulus. The only person: the theologian Bultmann,3 with whom I get together every week. Not at all stuffy.

It is too stupid that we are not at the same university. Here one notices more than anywhere else that one lives together with mere professors.

Sincere greetings from house to house

Your

Heidegger

23. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, May 19, 1925

Schwanallee 21

Dear Jaspers!

Sincerest thanks for your letter.' I would certainly have been surprised over your undertaking2-and I am even now surprised that you did it. Clearly, the technical reasons are very essential. In the way you take things as they are, they carry a lot of weight; however, making things easier is also a temptation, and the dissertations will increase. I would try to see to it that they decrease and are written in domains of other, specific sciences.

I see just now how I enjoy keeping myself from getting caught up doing political favors, as you constantly compromise your work. What I experienced in administering the tests for the State Examinations is ghastly. The lack of knowledge of the candidates is not what is troubling, but that we are forced to ask such things.

Where I can, I, of course, conduct my work in the way I think best. This summer I lecture from 7:00 to 8:00 in the morning on the history of the concept of time3-four hours per week-and I have 120 people in the class. I have gotten a foothold on firm ground here. To be sure, a coherent method of teaching at the level of proportionate requirements is not possible. The philosophy done by Jaensch4 is itself too primitive even for elementary school teachersand what will now come for Hartmann,5 who will certainly accept the offer from Cologne, is questionable.

Without knowing whether you would ever leave Heidelberg, I have spoken to Jaensch about the possibility of offering you a position. (Would you come in the first place?)

His immediate reaction, however, was negative, with the remark: "That would be, above all, a double filling of his narrower subject"-too German, he's afraid of competition.

Really, the agitation of these men! Hartmann and Jaensch want me to move up; if this is possible, I don't know. In any case, it is all the same to me-indeed, it is even preferable if I am less the official Ordinarius and can get on with my work. I only wish one thing-that the best one comes-but otherwise I know no one. Cas- sirer6 has no prospects here. Besides him, men like Max Wundt,7 Bauch,' and Scholz9 are serious candidates! Hartmann is against all three, but I don't want to put you off with such stuff. Only one more remark: that your colleague Hoffmann,10 at a meeting of the Friends of the Gymnaseum, made the most lamentable impression of all, and everyone was asking how such a person ever got a professorship in philosophy.

As content as I am here with my work, I feel all the less at home. My most stubborn students, who have gradually become narrow minded during the course of their studentship, are melting away, and I am finding younger people.

Nebel" wanted to go into the Bergmann house in Kiel. I was asked about him but couldn't recommend that he be chosen. He is clever but has little independence; industrious but untrustworthy and dishonest. That he plays me to an extreme-there where he is unknown-I can readily imagine. One must accordingly keep a sharp eye on him.

If you could give me some advice about filling the position, I would be very grateful.

By all means, please write me when you are at home during the fall holidays. Perhaps I could visit you in October on my return trip from the cabin.

My wife and boys are doing very well.

Sincere greetings

Your

faithful

Martin Heidegger

24. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, June 21, 1925

Dear Heidegger!

I thank you sincerely for your letter, to which I have a long answer in my head; but I do not write it because I fear misunderstanding, and I look forward all the more to your visit in October. From the middle of September on, we want to be in Heidelberg again. I would be very grateful if you could tell us as soon as possible when we may expect you, and please don't make your stay too short!

I wanted to answer you, first of all, because of your remarks about my publishing doctoral dissertations and, particularly, about how I am inclined to take the things as they are. About this, a cer tain philosophizing is immediately called for-and then your inquiry as to whether I would ever come to Marburg. Unfortunately, I can only answer this question with no. I have thought about it once again. You know how much it would mean to me to be with you in the same place, but I can not live in Marburg. That I would like to have an offer on practical grounds (to raise my salary and, respectively, the widow's pension, and to get a semester off) can not lead you to ignore my answer. You may not do this in respect to your faculty and administration.

Now, you ask, who should be offered the appointment. If you get the Ordinariat, I would nominate Frank' above all. You know my thoughts, but you know yourself how to gauge him, and relatively speaking, he seems to tower above the others. Ebbinghaus2 must first publish something; up to now, Frank has, without doubt, outdone him. The small Kant essay3 by Ebbinghaus, in my opinion, is not sufficient for an offer of appointment. If you don't get the Ordinariat, the situation is more difficult. Cassirer is, without question, the best. To be sure, he bores me, but he is instructive and, most of all, he has a noble way of writing, without the nastiness and hidden polemics of philosophy professors. That shows that he must be

somewhat decent as a human being. What I am looking for in philosophy I don't find in him, but where do we find it?

In my opinion, you can be pleased with your promotion in Marburg because it is happening without the least effort on your part. In themselves, these proceedings are naturally against the idea of the university. It wouldn't be possible in Heidelberg (the situation is different with an offer from elsewhere), and this can be traced back to the typical thinking of my colleagues: Your dangerous competition is already there, and the competition shouldn't be increased. I hope that you get the promotion, since it seems to me objectively justified in this unusual case. If I were a member of the Marburg faculty, I would have to be against it on principle. Here I have experience with cases that have fortunately been refused.

I am really filled with joy that I will be able to talk with you in October, and I long for it to happen. Then I could philosophize with you from the everyday occurrences and experiences that I am trying to transform here, basically with my wife and Marianne Weber!4 In the end, we have no other verification than our understanding and willing and doing in actual situations; whether they are significant or trivial is irrelevant to the matter. Actually, everything is important-and I am very dissatisfied, restless, and, in addition, often mixed with timidity, mindful of the right ways-but not always-but now I begin to write what can only be said concretely and can be brought out or covered over only in dialogue.

Until we meet again! Most sincerely

Your Karl Jaspers

25. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

July 24, 1925

D. J.

I thank you sincerely for your letter, from which I have learned something.

I am letting you know, very briefly, that I would like to come for a week in the first half of October. I can't specify the time exactly right now, because before this I am going to my home town, and the date hasn't been settled yet. I will let you know during September.

I am going to the cabin on August 1, and I am very much looking forward to the strong air of the mountains-this weak, light stuff down here ruins you over time. Eight days of wood chopping-then back to writing again.

Everything else in person.

My wife has already left with the boys.

Sincerely

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

Please send my regards, likewise, to your wife.

26. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, September 23, 1925

badischer Schwarzwald

Dear Jaspers!

My plans for the holidays were postponed because I must still be in Meffkirch on October 15 for my brother's wedding.'

Since I will begin my lectures on November 2, I still have time, especially since nothing pulls me back to Marburg except my work for the semester.

The question is whether you could still find use for me after October 16. If not, then we would have to put off our meeting until Christmas or early in the new year.

It is magnificent up here, and my preference would be just to stay at work up here until the new year. I have no desire for the company of professors; the peasants are much more pleasing and even more interesting.

I will stay here at the cabin until October 8.1 My wife and the boys will stay longer. Send your suggestions to me here.

By all means, I would like to say hello to you and your wife, and to stay from the seventeenth to the eighteenth-if you have no other visitors.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

27. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Cabin, October 2, 1925

Dear Jaspers!

I am glad that you have time for me after October 15.1

I am coming on the seventeenth. I cannot specify the train.

With warm greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

Please give Afra2 my best greetings.

28. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, November, 30, 1925

Dear Jaspers!

I thank you sincerely for the wonderful days in Heidelberg. I heard so much that I will not soon be finished with it.

Today I am writing very briefly. The entire family is sick-my wife is in bed with a very high fever-and without a servant girl.

The manuscript has been found. The curator tells me that he pressed for a quick appointment-but Richter wanted to summon me to Berlin before. I don't understand what that is supposed to mean. I am almost afraid that Richter wants to find out beforehand what I have in mind in terms of any eventual appointment.

The curator gave me to understand that, unfortunately, all kinds of machinations are at work in Berlin.

I am biding my time in peace. Frank is judged very favorably by Hartmann and our classical philologists.'

My thanks to your wife for the friendly picture.

I will write more when I am again left in peace.

My wife gave me a new picture of the boys for my birthday. You will receive a print of it.

Warm greetings to you and your wife

Your

Martin Heidegger

Greetings also from my wife.

29. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, December 10, 1925

Dear Jaspers!

Thank you once again for your letter,' which was a great joy to me for days.

Hopefully your lectures' are in full swing, and you don't have to seek refuge in the psychology of religion. The Hegel and Kant lessons give me an unusual amount of pleasure,3 and I am glad that I have only come to these matters now, when, relatively speaking, there is at least the possibility that I will understand something.

The Hegel studies would perhaps be too slow for you-we are now at becoming-and here, in my opinion, is a large gap. First of all, I don't understand in the least to what extent being and nothing-in the Hegelian sense-are supposed to be different. By contrast, I understand very well what Hegel declares to be the greatest paradox: that being and nothing are identical, for Hegel indeed determines-a strange beginning!- being in a completely negative way-the undetermined immediate. That this nullity is nothing or nothingness is indeed a tautology. How from this anything at all is supposed to become, where the thesis of the difference between being and nothing is completely mysterious-this I don't understand-and I always think that we would have to con duct such lessons together. Since I have the lessons transcribed, in the new year you will be able to see, more or less, what we are perpetrating. I have several Hegelians in the lessons from whom I unfortunately get no reaction. They are so Hegelianized that they don't know themselves where their heads are at, because they are completely Hegelianized without substance. The best part, however, is that I am beginning to really love Kant.

Now I come to a request. I told you, insofar as I can tell, about the academic association here, which is related to the former volunteer corps and whose scientific evenings I have somewhat in my care. I have

suggested to them that we read your Idea of the University. We need twelve copies. I would like to know if, for such purposes, you can get the books from your publisher for the author's price. I believe that I once heard that publishers no longer go in for such favors. If such a thing is possible, then I would also like one copy of your Psychology of Worldviews, which the association would like to acquire for its library.

Berlin isn't twitching. Perhaps I will come all at once to you during the Christmas vacation-however, my wife hasn't completely recovered yet; therefore, we are going to the cabin and the sun.

Sincere greetings to you in fidelity

Your

Martin Heidegger

30. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, December 16, 1925

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter' and for settling the question about the price of your books. Springer replied immediately and guaranteed a discount of 20 percent. The books will arrive any day. Your remarks were especially illuminating for me, insofar as I tried to understand on the basis of becoming, and becoming is really the first thing that is thought-insofar as it is actually thought only in the sublation of what is different-so that Hegel, in order to begin in actual thinking, commences with becoming-which explicates itself in itself, and so being immediately comes in as the condition of the possibility of the beginning of dialectical thinking about the beginning, and must at the same time be a beginning, because it is the emptiest determination of the end in the sense of the absolute.

I understand from becoming that being and nothing are sublated within it. One can find this formally in becoming-but that doesn't mean the reverse: that being and nothing constitute becoming. Aristotle, in my view, already stated validly against Plato that on the basis of heterotes, on and me on, there is no movement and nothing is conceived.

Here I get no further, and the hole that lies in the dialectical movement is the most fundamental, for to me it is proof that Hegel from the beginning failed categorially to grasp life-existenceprocess and the like. That is, he didn't see that the traditional stock of categories from the logic of things and the world is fundamentally insufficient, and that we must question more radically, not only about becoming and motion, happening and history-but about being itself.

It is completely unclear whether being-which Hegel calls the abstract-is abstract in the sense of the highest possible genuswhich is impossible in principle according to Aristotle-or whether it is something like the formally

objective. In the latter case, it is inconceivable how this formal being is supposed to determine itself according to concrete categories.

It seems to me that it is neither a genus nor something formally universal, but something for which Hegel himself had no possibility of characterizing and about which he doesn't ask.

I am thankful that fate protected me from corrupting Kant and Hegel by looking at them through any of the eyeglasses that are on sale these days. I believe the spirit of the world can be perceived close to these two.

We are sending both of our boys to you and your wife for Christmas.' On the twentieth (Sunday), we will leave here at 7:30 by express train and will arrive in Freiburg about 3:00. Because we are travelling with a joint ticket-also on return-I, unfortunately, cannot get off the train in Heidelberg, and the stop in Heidelberg is too short for me to ask you to come to the station. So, unfortunately, it will have to be in March.

Sincere greetings to you, and I wish
you and your wife a joyful
celebration

Your Martin Heidegger

My wife sends warm greetings to you both.

31. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg a./L., February 17, 1926

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter.' In the last few days, I was constantly on the verge of writing you. I will give your student a time for the conference before I leave. I am happy that the exchange is becoming more fluid.

Herr Nebel seems indeed to have landed with Hoffmann. There it is cheaper to play the great man with foreign treasure. If something decent comes of this, then that is also good.

Now I come to a request. Lowith wants to submit something to the Emergency Society.2 I don't know any of these great men at all, and certainly none of them knows me. As far as I know, H. Maier3 is the reviewer for philosophy, and it would be good if somehow there were advance preparation. To be sure, the submission is not about phenomenology but, coming from me, it could indirectly scare Maier away. Do you know him well enough from his time in Heidelberg that you could write him-and do you think that such a path is at all feasible? A student of Kroner's, who is ostensibly working on Hegel, has been running around here for two years and has been on scholarship the whole time. In my seminar, he makes a downright pitiful impression.

Lowith has become much calmer and more assured since Italy, and I believe that something will come of him within certain limits. As a curiosity: A few days ago, the government sent the list back with the notation that I did not match the importance of the professorship and that they would like further nominations. The faculty wants to stand by its recommendation-in practical terms nothing will change-and the whole thing is indifferent to me. The only thing is that we don't now get someone completely mediocre, and there is talk that the government has a certain candidate in mind.

Since Windelband4 is the reviewer, there was for me nothing else to expect from the beginning. Now I am, naturally, a member of the committee. We are going to the Black Forest at the beginning of March, and we will stay for the entire vacation. I will drop by to see you, then, in April; for how long depends on my work. I feel that I am very well in stride, and I got through the winter without any exhaustion, and I would like to keep the momentum of the semester going through the vacation.

In Hegel's logic, I haven't gotten past becoming or the second triad. I will bring the transcript with me in the spring.

Sincerest greetings, also from my
wife from your

Martin Heidegger

32. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, April 24, 1926

["Postmarked 4/26" added by Jaspers]

Dear Jaspers!

As you see, we are still sitting up here. On April 1, I began the proofs of my treatise, Being and Time.' It comprises about thirtyfour sheets. I am really in full swing, and I am only irritated about the coming semester and the narrow-minded atmosphere that will again surround me.

The faculty wants to nominate me again and to attach the already printed sheets. The whole thing has been botched, and is a matter of indifference to me.

That Otto2 intrigued against me is certain. That Maier or Jaeger3 judged my Aristotle unfavorably is impossible, because I have never given the manuscript to a single person. That this rumor is circulating precisely in Heidelberg will have its reasons. It is doubtless a diversionary maneuver coming from Scheffelstrage 4.4

The most painful thing is that I must pass through Heidelberg this time. I can't bring all of my research material with me-and, most of all, I would be rather useless, because I am concentrated in too particular a manner and not open enough.

I must expressly thank you once again today for the little Schelling volume.5 Philosophically, Schelling dares to go much further than Hegel, even if he is conceptually sloppier. I have only begun to read the treatise on freedom.6 It is too valuable for me to want to become acquainted with it for the first time by roughly skimming it.

Now, unfortunately, it will have to be autumn before we see each other again-unless you and your wife come to see us sooner in Marburg.

Both of the boys got through scarlet fever at the cabin.

It is already deep in the night. A storm sweeps over the mountains; the beams creak in the cabin; life lies before the soul: pure, simple, and great.

I often wish that you could be up here in such moments. Sometimes I no longer comprehend how we can play such strange roles down below.

Sincere greetings to you and
your wife Your

Martin Heidegger

My wife sends sincere greetings.

We are going back on April 30.

33. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, May 24, 1926

Dear Jaspers!

I wrote to you fourteen days ago about the case of a female student of mine who has become ill and to ask you for some practical advice on several questions. Since I still haven't heard from you today, and I know that in such cases you respond immediately, I assume that the letter did not arrive.'

A friend of the one who is ill, who is likewise a student of mine, would like to personally ask you for advice. She can also give you better information about what you need to know in order to make a judgment about the entire case.

I know that asking you to help with advice and to admit Frl. Weil 2 for a consultation is asking a lot from you, especially since you have removed yourself from practice, and such cases always come at a personal cost to you in terms of energy-but you will not deny me the request when I tell you that these are good people who deserve it.

If the way things stand is still something that can be helped, and if the disease hasn't taken its inevitable course, I don't dare to judge.

Up to now, I am very satsified with Kristeller;3 he seems to be a very changeable person. Since we invited him to play our grand piano-he plays excellently and accompanies me while I work-he has come more out of himself. What he can do, I can't yet tell.

I am well in stride again and do not detect any fatigue from excitement. Today I gave a lecture at the Whitsun celebration of the academic association that read your Idea of the University last winter semester; the title: "On the Essence of Truth."4

Hopefully, after the exertion of these last months, there will not be a snag at the end; however, one always has to pay with something.

I wrote in my last letter how much your words have delighted and inspired me. I expect that only a few will study what I am doing; only you will understand my actual intention. For me, it is completely a transitional work. From the fact that Husserl finds the whole thing to be off-putting, and can no longer fit it under phenomenology in the usual sense, I conclude that I have de facto already gone much further than I believe or see myself.

The latest version: There is talk here about Ernst Hoffmann as a candidate for the open position.

Nothing more has happened yet.

If you have some time for Frl. WeiI, then this letter is already answered. I don't want to further disturb the vacation that you are spending with your relatives.

My wife and the boys are well.

Most sincerely

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

Sincere greetings to your wife.

P.S. If the visit is inconvenient for you today, Frl. WeiI can also stay another day.

34. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, July 31, 1926

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter.' I waited until today to answer, because yesterday I had a talk with Kristeller.2

First, my impression from the entire semester: He has, without doubt, a philosophical instinct, but one cannot get by with this alone. He is lacking in two things: first, a concrete philosophical knowledge that grows out of forceful interpretation (that holds as well in reference to German Idealism), and then the assurance of a concrete investigation of a problem in the field. He thinks in a framework that is musically constructed and composed. To him, the main thing is that the idea isn't false and that the edifice is immanently well fastened. I told him this on the occasion of a report on Hegel. It had all of the merits of philosophical presentiment and compact presentation but moved about too vaguely in generalities. Yesterday, I strongly advised him against a purely systematic project, but I also do not doubt that he has the capacities and the energy to undertake real work. Whether he will now get used to my way of working, I would nearly doubt. Despite this, I believe that with stricter guidance, something valuable will come out of it. In any case, whether he chooses you or me, I believe he is worth the effort.

My proofs3 progressed well until the end of June, then the work of the semester got over my head, as I burdened myself with all of the examination stuff. At the beginning of June, the faculty submitted two copies of a clean proof of the first part of my work to the ministry and stressed once again that they stand by their nomination. Practically speaking, it won't succeed. The only disadvantage the impenetrable tactic of Becker4 has for me is that now, in the third semester, I have to manage all of my teaching activities and squander my energies.

We are finally moving out of our unhealthy apartment. The move is next week. I am traveling to Engadin5 for eight days on Husserl's invitation. Then I am going to the cabin, where I will finish the proofs. Then I hope to visit you at the end of the vacation. I wish you a right good rest during the vacation and a splendid period for work.

Sincerest greetings from

Your

Martin Heidegger

Sincere greetings to your wife.

35. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, October 4, 1926

bad. Schwarzw.

Dear Jaspers!

It is very difficult for me to tell you that I cannot come. I suspended the printing in the middle of the semester and, after a very short rest, went back to work with revisions. The work has become more extensive than I thought, so I must now divide it about every twenty-five sheets. I must deliver the remainder of the first volume by November 1, so everyday is precious. I even had to write off my mother in Megkirch, whom I wanted to visit during the days in Heidelberg.

Now I am hoping for Christmas. It is not likely that we will go to the cabin this time.

In the meantime, the volume will be printed in full. I would like you to read the treatise in an externally pleasing condition. When it is available in clean proofs, I will send it to you immediately. I don't need to say at length that I looked forward, and still look forward, to the days with you. I feel with certainty that this time we will express ourselves to one another more completely than ever before and that we will become even closer.

Not a day passes that I don't think of you and your work, and am thankful that we found one another.

It is all the more painful to me that I can't come, knowing that you had a difficult summer.' I wish very much that you become free of this burden for the work that lies before you.

We had the most magnificent week up here, practically without a single had day. I am coming out of it, to be sure, with less than usual-but the wood

chopping, the peasants, with whom I have become very friendly, and the clear mountain air keep me fresh. This time my wife was bound again to the cabin for four of the most beautiful weeks, because our boys got the measles, one after the other. Now they are jumping and romping again.

In Marburg we moved to a much healthier and nicer place at the end of the semester (Barfi ertor 15), which also made my stay in that foggy nest substantially easier.

Herr Kristeller has decided to go to Hoffmann. I thought he would have expected something else from himself.

Please write back soon and tell me if it is convenient for you and your wife if I were to come after the Christmas holidays. My wife plans to travel with the childern to Wiesbaden then to visit her parents.

Sincere greetings from house
to house Your

Martin Heidegger

36. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, October 27, 1926

Dear Heidegger!

You must hear from me directly that the Starring' professorship in Bonn has been offered to me. Rothackerz got and accepted the Wentscher3 professorship. On November 8, I will begin negotiating in Berlin. It still isn't certain what we will do. Living arrangements and salary will be decisive. We are thinking of traveling to Bonn tomorrow.

In haste and with sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

37. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, December 2, 1926

Dear Jaspers!

Despite the delay, this time it will work out so that we can see one another. I have nothing planned for the vacation. I have enough to do until January 1. Our vacation lasts until the eleventh.

Yesterday, I received news from the Dean that the Herr Minister' rejected the nomination from the faculty for the second time. What I had expected has happened. The matter is completely indifferent to me, but less so the fact that, with the condition of our faculty, nothing can be done in respect to the new recommendations. I also belong to the committee now. The one part of the faculty has a single principle: no Jews and, if at all possible, a German national: the other part (Jaensch and his followers), only something mediocre and nothing dangerous.

Furthermore, it is just as certain that maneuvers are going on in Berlin, as in my case, so that my recommendations will remain without effect.

Otherwise, everything is well with us. The new house is magnificent. The university boring. The students simple-minded, without any particular motivation. As I am very occupied with the problem of negativity, I have here the best opportunity to study what the nothing looks like.

When you have the time, please write with the exact date that I can come.

With sincere greetings
Your

Martin Heidegger

38. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Sincere thanks for your letter.'

What I am trying to do, in respect to the most obvious concept, I found stated most clearly today by Hegel (Preface to The Phenomenology of Spirit, p. 25: It is the most common self-deception ...).2

I took the bull-or what I take to be the bull-by the horns. I can't do otherwise.

R.'s3 judgment will not remain alone.

I will not allow myself to be disturbed, not because I estimate my work too highly-but because I have learned to understand, on its ground, what greater ones wanted to do.

I can wait until another comes who at least grasps the instinct and does it better. I am looking forword to our conversations.

With sincere greetings

Your Martin Heidegger

December 21, 1926

39. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, December 26, 1926

Dear Jaspers!

I thank you sincerely for your letter.' Your impression and instinctive agreement is most valuable to me. My work will not bring me more than what I already have from you: that I have gotten free for myself and can pose questions with my own certainty and direction. The connection with the appointment story, however negatively this may play out, is good in that I have gottten loose from those things-and, most of all, the possibility of our communication has become a bit more concrete.

I would have had to be mistaken about my own intentions if I had expected anything other than rejection from Rickert. That his decision was unfriendly will have its reason in the fact that he went around the bend and fell into a rage.

If the treatise is written against anyone, it is against Husserl, who saw this immediately but stayed positive from the very beginning. What I am writing against, to be sure, only indirectly, is pseudophi- losophy. What I am fighting for is the understanding of what we in philosophy can-and also must-only repeat as the central possibility. And that, I believe, one cannot make difficult enough.

Everything is obviously still too complicated to make the passion for what is self-evident fruitful the way Plato, Aristotle, and Kant could, despite the many trivialities and formalities. When I think about how I have understood Kant (i.e., learned to love Kant), in the course of my work, then the momentarily successful hostility of a so-called Kantian is completely indifferent to me. Incidentally, what in the world people like Windelband2 and Rickert are supposed to have in common with Kant, such that they deserve this name, is today completely incomprehensible to me.

I think we will not want to talk any further about Rickert and the whole business but will want to devote our time together to something else.

I will come then on January 1. I will let you know the exact time of arrival.

With the same post, you will receive sheets 17 and 18. I will bring the rest with me, up to 23. Four sheets are still missing. I am very much looking forward.

Sincere greetings from

Your

Martin Heidegger

Please give warm greetings to your wife from both of us.

40. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, December 30, 1926

Dear Jaspers!

I arrive in Heidelberg on January 1 at 11:02. With sincere greetings and best wishes for the new year from house to house,

Your

Martin Heidegger

[Sender:] Heidegger

Marburg

Barfiigertor 15

41. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, March 1. 1927

Dear Jaspers!

Please accept my apologies for writing only now to thank you and your wife for the days at Christmas. This time I was unfortunately too tired and exhausted, as you noticed.

But I am very glad that I was with you, and I believe that we have once again come a bit further. I am happy for you that the project' has a firm shape in outline-that is what is essential.

The boys thank you sincerely for the playthings. I was received with veritable Indian howls.

At the beginning of February, I was called to Mef3kirch by telegraph: my mother had to have an operation (intestinal cancer): She has been lying down since then-there is no longer any hope. That I am a big worry for her and make dying difficult, you will generally comprehend.

The last hour that I spent with my mother-I really had to come back here-was a piece of practical philosophy that will stay with me.

I believe that for most philosophers the question of theology and philosophy-or, better, belief and philosophy-is purely for the writing desk.

The printing works paused again for a long time, so only today can I send off the last sheet of the first corrected draft.

I have a request. If you haven't made any notes for your own use on the sheets, and if you are not reading them now, I would be very grateful if you would send the sheets to Frl. cand. phil. H. Weig, Berlin W 15, Brandenburgische Str. 36 Ghs. I. I would like another complete revision in

respect to significant typographical errors, and Frl. Weif3 is of very great help to me in this. I will then let Frl. Weig take care of the remaining sheets. You will then shortly receive a proper copy.

Yesterday the decisive faculty meeting ended at 1:30 at night. The result, to be sure, was nothing to write home about. I. Driesch.2 II. pari loco: Pichler3 and Mahnke.4 In respect to what was threatened, in all likelihood, I warded off Bauch, Max Wundt, Becher.' In the introduction to the list, Cassirer is respectfully excluded. What I could have done for you, with some help, would have met the same fate. You are too good for this, all the more so as I completely failed-even with my friends-to explain what your Psychology is trying to do. The phrase double occupancy, which Jaensch pronounced, could no longer be rebuffed. Even the current list was still too good for the faculty, and it would not have taken much for them to fall too, until I took energetic, drastic action. This time it was done not with pain to the kidneys but to the ears. And the worst of it was the gentlemen had no disciplinary interest at all; rather it was only a matter of strengthening the German-national and people's party in the faculty. Furthermore, I am not so sure the government won't still send Bauch, since this name was officially given to the Dean in Berlin. It is clear in what direction the wind is blowing. At the beginning, I said some.things about Neokantianism that Windel-band can find amusing.

Tomorrow we are going to the cabin with a few students. Now I want only rest, mountains, sun, and physical renewal.

Hopefully, you and your wife have still been spared the flu. I don't know how it will go with the return trip. Presumably, my wife and the children will stay up there until Pentacost.

I wish you a wonderful period of work and a good push ahead in the coming months of the new year.

With sincere greetings to you and your wife

Your Martin Heidegger

My wife also sends sincere greetings.

42. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, March 2, 1927

Dear Heidegger!

I found your letter, for which I thank you sincerely, in the guest room on the desk upon which you otherwise work. Our house is being painted, carpeted, etc. During this I am lodging out but often go down to check and direct; therefore, I am not doing actual work, but I am preparing my summer seminar on Hegel's Phenomenology.

You are having a difficult experience with your mother, which I can comprehend from a distance. That the alternative philosophytheology can play a role here is heart rending. If I were to inject myself into it, I would-in the consciousness of knowing nothing, but respecting the belief of the loved one, more than that, recognizing it as truth-perhaps speak in its forms and representations, and ask him to put in a good word for me in heaven, and promise on my side to do what I could. But to you that will seem very remote and hopeless.

As a disciplinary matter, I wouldn't want to replace the alternative philosophy-theology with the one between philosophy and belief. There are nonbelieving philosophers and theologians. The nonbelieving theologian turns to the objectivity of the church and hears confirmation and gets guarantees there. The nonbelieving philosopher does just the same. Like, for example, the Grand Duke' who, with Kuno Fischer,' found assurance and peace in his belief in immortality, because such a learned and intelligent man asserted it. The alternative between belief and nonbelief is much deeper. Only with a more definite level of education is there the one between theology and philosophy.

That is insignificant in light of the reality that you are grasping with your mother. There it will go with you as it also goes with me in other experiences: Philosophy is remembering-not about previous experiences of

the soul, but about the real present, which, philosophically, I understand and do not understand, and thus it prepares us for a new reality.

My best thanks for the communication about the list of philosophers named for appointment! Now, at least, you have the thing behind you.

Sincere greetings!

Your Karl Jaspers

I took pains with the handwriting. But the worn-out pen scratched-and everything else is packed up.

43. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Cabin, April 18, 1927

Dear Jaspers!

Tomorrow I will leave the cabin and go to my mother for a few more days. The weeks up here were magnificent. My wife will leave eight days later. Both of the boys will stay up here.

A while ago, I instructed the publisher to send you a copy of Being and Time. Hopefully, you have had fine weeks of work and have also recovered from the hard winter. This summer I am dealing with Hegel's Logic and Aristotle's Metaphysics.' As far as I remember, you are dealing with Hegel's Phenomenology' If, for me, you could do without Rosenkranz's3 On Hegel's Logic and the History of the Development of the Logic by the same author (I don't know the exact title), it would be a great favor. From April 23 on, I will be back in Marburg. Since we are beginning earlier because of the jubilee,`' I unfortunately will not be able to stop over with you.

Hopefully, it will work out in the fall, so that we can come to visit with our boys. Would you consider a plan to come to Marburg this summer? We would do everything possible for you. I would be very happy and so would my wife.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your faithful Martin Heidegger

44. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, May 1, 1927

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you very much for your card and for the book.' I still haven't been able to read it but have only leafed through it and quickly read a few dozen pages. It seems to me as it did at Christmas:2 as if we had climbed to a new level but couldn't find our way around on it; hence the partnership of not-yet-formulated origins and the avoidance, indeed mutual strangeness, of the first gestures and the still half-blind orientation from both of us. A truth shines forth herthat is almost buried over by so much circumstance. I feel the same way about my own attempts.

Unfortunately, the last months have been bad for me-external disturbances caused by the house-and I have worked only a little. Now there is peace-for how long?-and I hope to make progress during the semester, as far as I am able to combine work and lecturing.

As to Rosenkranz: In the next few days I will send you

1. Modifications of the Logic

2. Illuminations on Hegel's Encyclopedia.3

In addition, there is a Science of the Logical Idea, an original Hegelian logic that diverges from Hegel on an essential point (in the style of Erdmann4 and Kuno Fischer5). I believe you can easily get it in Marburg. For me, it is occasionally useful for comparisons but, to be sure, mostly disappointing, like both of the writings I am sending you.

Please excuse the tired letter. At the moment, I am not at all in stride, although I am physically quite well.

Sincerest

Your Karl Jaspers

45. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, May 8, 1927

Dear Heidegger!

Your notice from Mef3kirch brought us the news that your mother's suffering has come to an end.' I sincerely press your hand. What the death of your mother meant to you at the end, I cannot know. I hope that fate was good to you and allowed you to satisfy your mother's heart without any untruth. If not, no philosophy will help but only forces one to hold fast to the question.

Sincerest

Your Karl Jaspers

Dear Herr Heidegger,

sincerely thinking of you

Your Gertrud Jaspers

46. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, September 27, 1927

Dear Jaspers!

The time is approaching in which I usually visit you. This conclusion of the summer vacation and transition into the winter semester is something in the course of my days that I always look forward to long in advance.

Today I would only like to ask if you or your wife could use me as a guest after October 15.

I only participated in our glorious jubilee' for one day, was then physically and mentally exhausted, and immediately came here with my wife and the boys.

This summer semester, at the beginning of which was the death of my mother, was not at all easy. At my last visit, however, I was able to take my leave from Mother without being troubled, but this abundance of goodness at first made the separation most difficult.

Up here, we are satisfied and content; my wife and the children will go back only at the end of October. Hopefully, it is going as well with you and your wife as it is with us cabin dwellers.

I would be very happy if I could visit you again. Since you gave me the little Schelling volume,' I haven't let go of the essay on freedom. In the coming semester, I will hold lessons on it-and, to do this, I hope for your help.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your Faithful

Martin Heidegger

47. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, October 1, 1927

Dear Heidegger!

Sincere thanks for your letter. I am very happy about your announcement. You are always welcome with me. Just write the day that I can expect you. It is doubtful as to whether you will meet my wife. At present she is in Paris' and will stay for about another ten days, and then, after a few days in Heidelberg, she will go to see her father;2 therefore, I cannot invite your wife and children again this time, otherwise I would gladly see them. We are expecting a niece3 for the semester, a student who will live with us. If there should be a collision, she would hopefully be content with a north mansard (no one lives upstairs any more, and we have all the space for ourselves).

I have been at home again only for the last eight days. We were at the North Sea. Since Christmas, the vexations of existence have taken a lot of energy from me; the rest I have devoted to my work,' which has progressed but will not be finished for a long time. I am not at all pleased that I still haven't studied your book after the hurried reading at Christmas. The moment for this will come naturally and without force.' Please be patient, even though this must justifiably disappoint you.

It is all the more important that we see each other soon and talk.

Right now I am looking for a way back to work by studying Kant for the winter semester (Critique of Judgment).6 My lecture should bring me the fifth chapter of my project:7 metaphysics. If it doesn't suffice, then I'll take the usual, cheaper way out: history, which, as a precaution, I have also announced in parentheses.8

Sincere greetings, to your wife as well from your

Karl Jaspers

48. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, October 6, 1927

Dear Jaspers!

I thank you sincerely for your letter, and I am very glad that I can come.

The Kant studies are right on the mark. This winter I am giving a four-hour interpretation of the Critique of Pure Reason.' I am very curious about the further development of your projects. Because the weather up here is magnificent, I will stay a while longer. I will come just around October 20, and then I would like, if it is alright with you, to stay for eight days.

It doesn't matter at all where you put me; I do not make demands.

It is too had that I will not meet your wife this time.

Hopefully you have rested well at the sea.

From the middle of August until the beginning of September, I had a bad inflammation of the middle ear, so the vacation was rather shot as far as work is concerned.

I will announce myself immediately, then, when I arrive.

With sincere greetings also from my wife

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

49. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, October 8, 1927

Dear Jaspers!

I am just going home tomorrow, so my arrival with you will be delayed. I will arrive on the 23rd or the 24th. Today, just the report that I have been named an Ordinarius.1 Mahnke was given my position at the same time.

With sincerest greetings,
your

Martin Heidegger

[Sender:] Heidegger

Todtnauberg

bad. Schwarzwald

50. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, November 8, 1927

Dear Jaspers!

In the crush at the beginning of the semester I am just now able to thank you sincerely for the days. Schelling has become even more present to me, so I do not approach these difficult things entirely unprepared.

I have now read completely the piece by Frl. Salditt.1 The whole thing is not a piece of writing about philosophy, but it is philoso- phizingly written-I find in it genuine perspectives for an interpretation of Shakespeare.

Clearly, which does no harm in this form, its dependence upon you is stronger than you are able to see yourself-but it certainly is not an imitative repetition. That happens to me and to my negative philosophy-which indeed has only a narrow positive windowmuch more easily and more often.

It is not easy for me to preserve my independence in relation to my own work and to hold it ready for new overturnings.

I hope that you are beginning the semester with as much enthusiasm and self-sacrifice as I, at least, believe I am doing.

Sincere greetings to you and your wife.

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

My wife greets you likewise sincerely.

51. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, January 4, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

I still haven't thanked you for your letter from November. I wrote the sentences about Frl. Salditt' to her, except for the last one. I get philosophical letters from her every couple of weeks, which awaken in me a paradoxical longing for America.

I have gladly thought about the days when we were together; the complete loneliness to which one is condemned in philosophical thinking is then lifted for a moment. That another finds this intellectual exertion important-or even more important than I-is not only a satisfaction, but the fact as such is a strong impulse. It covers over the soft pain which remains, because I have the feeling that, in a sense, the answer is sometimes not forthcoming from you- without my knowing what kind of answer I mean and would like.

I have worked very well this semester until now, and I am involved with very difficult things about which I doubt whether one would find them deep or absurd. For me, it is a matter of doubt as to the form of expression and communication, not as to the substance of what I am thinking about. It is our fate: A new world reveals itself, and we are pitiful human beings who can notice it, but we cannot accomplish its philosophical, or, what would be more important, its poetic expression.

But that is just empty talk. I wish I could give you the text' soon, but it will still be a long time. I am actually writing today because of the happenstance that I am thanking Mahnke3 for sending me his reviews on Dilthey, and I may not send a letter to Marburg without writing to you. The reviews give you the most desirable position in relation to Dilthey and Husserl4 but don't touch upon what I value most highly in your philosophy

and about which neither of these two have the faintest idea: that basically everything is metaphysical or stands in direct relation to it.

I hope everything is going well with you. Warm greetings also to your wife and from mine as well.

Your Karl Jaspers

52. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, January 14, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

The bearer of this letter, Dr. Grassi' of Milan, would like to speak with you personally. He is studying German philosophy, has read your book, and knows a surprising lot about it- naturally with misunderstandings from the tradition, but at the same time with astonishing accuracy. I believe you will be delighted with the lively interest and the clear questions that he poses.

Sincere greetings!

Your Karl Jaspers

53. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, February 10, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Sincerest thanks for your letter over the Christmas vacation. I intended at the end of the vacation to stop over with you for a couple of hours on my way back from the Black Forest, but then I got pressed for time. Dr. Grassi makes an immediate impression with his intensity and a certain understanding; however, I have become doubtful as to what extent he isn't of a fundamentally journalistic nature in search of a dernier cri. The semester is loaded down with a lot of stuff, and I dread my existence as an Ordinarius, should that come to pass. Why the answer is still pending in my case, which I certainly perceive, has its reason in the fact that I have not yet again put my heart into it. For the time being, I edify myself everyday with Kant, whom one can interpret with greater vehemence and thoroughness than Aristotle. I believe he must be discovered completely anew.

In the summer, I am reading Logic,' and I hope that in the spring I will be better disposed again for a real conversation. I am unable at present, purely in regard to the subject matter, to master Schelling, because I am a very slow reader.

My wife has remained up above with the children since the Christmas vacation and stays with a peasant woman. I am very glad that they have all gotten away from the damp, rainy nest here.

I am writing today actually only because of a practical and pressing matter. Here with us in the philosophical faculty, an Ordinariat in national economics is to be appointed. Both representatives are fools, and the particulars they give are equally bad. We need a younger power, who has a concrete mastery of political economy, but who also knows how to independently take hold of theoretical political economy at the same time. May I ask you to request from Alfred Weber,' whom I do not know

personally, an overview of the situation in this subject and the characteristics of those who come into question? There is indeed no trust in our representatives. To my regret, I am myself on the committee, and I don't know anyone else to ask. To simply let the thing run its course is also unacceptable.

I hope all is well with you and your wife.

With sincerest greetings to you both

Yours

Martin Heidegger

54. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, February 12, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

I am immediately writing what I have just learned from A. Weber. If something else occurs to him, you will receive a second letter.

By far the most important person among those who are not yet an Ordinarius would be Kurt Singer' from Hamburg: originally a money theorist (a work Money as Sign,2 in which he is a student of Knapps3). Exceptional experience in the practical and the theoretical. Leader of the Economic Service,4 an authoritative weekly. Extraordinary education. A follower of George. Recently a Plato book;5 brilliant stylist. Very unjustly passed over everywhere, until now. About forty years old. Jewish, of small stature, a physical condition that has often bothered him!

Herr v. Eckardt,6 who is the director of the Institute for journalism here, confirmed this evaluation to me in an interesting way (although, as I know from another side, he is personally on bad terms with Kurt Singer). He says: an intellectually significant man. His polarities: Knapp and George, "passion to the point of scientific fanaticism." "Pure, upstanding soul." Just a little embittered and overexaggerated. The most significant man who would come into question.

Also named by A. Weber:

Arthur Salz7 here in Heidelberg. I know him personally as a decent, noble human being. Well-to-do. An aristocrat in every gesture. Also Jewish. A friend of Gundolf.8 An independent relationship with George. Works in progress on social economics,9 among other things. Once, in his youth, he committed a piece of scholarly foolishness, in which Max Weber took him under protection and, while not exactly blaming himself publicly, nevertheless testified rather too much on his behalf. But that was twenty

years ago and is forgotten. He was not a good teacher but has gotten much better after a stomach operation that made him healthy. Objectively far inferior to Singer. A light among the frightful mediocrity of the younger generation (although he himself will likely be forty-five years old). A personality who sets standards and makes demands for himself and for others. Not forceful. I can imagine that his aristocratic calmness could also be mere passivity.

Finally, Weber nominated Ritschl10 from the family of theologians," but didn't know where he took his habilitation. He only knows him personally from a five-minute meeting. He was recommended to him from many sides. Very young. Rises far above the low level of the next generation. Among other things, he is working on "questions of locality",12 one of A. Weber's special areas. I didn't get a picture of him.

Lederer has gone away. I can only talk about him tomorrow and the day after. If I hear anything new, I will let you know immediately. Alas, Lederer has no sense for the personal level, which for us must be what is most important in the decline of today.

I would most strongly recommend Kurt Singer. I only saw him briefly in 1924, and I have never forgotten him.

From the younger Ordinariuses, v. Eckardt recommended Lenz13 from Giessen to me.

In the meantime, Dr. Grassi has made the same impression on me as with you. If you give him your little finger, he wants to completely gobble you up, but it remains astonishing how quickly he grasps philosophical matters. He is a brilliant interviewer.

How my heart races when you write about Kant! He is the only one I actually believe. Discover him anew? Yes, but finally only for yourself-then everything is indeed revealed. Every effort of interpretation is for the many only another doctrine, as it was before with Neokantianism-that handmaiden to science instead of theology-and then even more to theology! I see it in the seminar,14 where thoughts that to me have a fleeting meaning

in their appropriative function are recited as knowledge. When I recently quoted from Virchow,15 losing all continance: "Our statements come back to us in a form that horrifies us," the real point, correspondingly, did not come back to me.

What Kant actually is, I can never know. At the moment, I would say: He is finally serious about the fact that God is concealed and about the only discernable demand that God makes upon humans-to be free. He interprets freedom as the dignity in existence and in thought that is proper to human beings without presumption; and also the insignificance without wretched humiliation. With him, all ontology comes to an end. Thought is only the transparency of the transcendent in appearance. It is a magnificent suspension in which a human being comes to that point where he can say "himself," but in such a way that precisely there, where he actually is himself, he is no longer only himself.

I look forward to your visit in the spring, from the bottom of my heart. Please tell me when you will come as soon as you know.

My work has progressed, but it won't be finished for a long time.

Sincere greetings,

Your Karl Jaspers

55. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, February 25, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Today I received an offer from Freiburg; the faculty there unanimously nominated me unico loco. Before I negotiate and decide, I would like to talk the whole thing over with you.

In any case, we are traveling to the Black Forest on Tuesday (the 28th). I would like to stay over in Heidelberg and then go to the ministry in Karlsruhe early on Wednesday.

I will arrive on Tuesday around 12:00, and ask that you don't put yourself out; above all, if you still read in the afternoon, please take no notice of my presence. As for the rest, a sofa will suffice for the night.

Everything else in person. I am rather tired from the semester.

With sincere greetings to you and your wife
and also from my wife

Your

Martin Heidegger

56. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, March 6, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

My negotiations were relatively short. Just before, Schworer' had to go to the provincial assembly because of the high-debt debate. He was extremely friendly and fraternal. He asked me rather directly about my salary in Marburg and noted down my requests. He then said he wanted to speak to the Minister at once and would immediately give me a report. Today it came:

1. Beginning of service on October 1.

2. Basic salary according to the fourth level of salary group A 1 with 11,600 Marks. Housing bonus 1,728. Children bonus.

3. Instructional fee guarantee, 3,000 Marks.

4. Remuneration of moving expenses.

5. Years of service calculated from the time of habilitation (re: retirement).

6. Housing construction bonus-will be reviewed with good will.

Thus number 3 reduced and number 6 very uncertain. The latter is very important, since it is very difficult to get a place to live in Freiburg, but I think we will reach an agreement.

From Bonn, I have a report from a committee member:2

I. Psychology: Philos.-Edu. I. Litt,[4] Bauch, Freytag!![5]
Becher[3] *unico loco.* II. Jaspers, Rothacker!![6]

The committee was very large. Those outside of the subject were for me, whereupon the Catholic Dyroff' declared that he took my nomination as a personal affront. With this, my candidacy collapsed.

You have also come to this strange position in this most strange company through the nonphilosophers. The list has not yet been approved by the faculty.

Nevertheless, I consider your prospects to be very favorableor perhaps the entire list will be rejected by the government.

I am happy to be up here. We have made many beautiful outings under glorious sunshine.

When I consider to a certain extent the next few weeks, I will write with the time of my arrival.

Many thanks to you and. your wife for the picture.

Sincere greetings also from my wife

Your

Martin Heidegger

57. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, March 23, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you very much for your letter. Your conditions are certainly not bad. It is too bad that, almost without exception, reductions are made in the attempt to reach agreement! Hopefully, you will still have success!

Your information concerning the Bonn lists naturally sparked in me a lively interest. I would like the appointment,' and I also really like Bonn, but the chances are certainly slim.

Now I am waiting for you to tell me when you will arrive, and I look forward to our conversations.

The work is progressing slowly.

Sincere greetings, also to your wife
and from mine

Your Karl Jaspers

58. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, March 25, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Sincerest thanks for your letter. What was previously stricken has been directly agreed to by Schw.' I was called to Berlin, per telegraph from Ri.,3 for the 28th. Before the return trip to Karlsruhe, where I will give final notice, I would like to get your advice once again. I will allow myself time to come by at some point on Thursday the 29th, and will stay with you until early Friday. I cannot exactly determine the time for the real visit; in any case, not before April 15.

Everything else in person.

I have recuperated magnificently up here.

Sincere greetings from house
to house

Your Martin Heidegger

59. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Cabin, April 13, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Because I am buying a house(!), I have to stay in Freiburg on Monday the 16th. On Tuesday the 17th, I am bringing our oldest to Mainz, then I will come back to Heidelberg that evening.

I am very much looking forward to it.

Sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

60. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, May 1, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Thank you sincerely for the beautiful days in Heidelberg. Your generosity always sustains me for the entire semester. I only wish that your work will now reach conclusion without interruption. The situation: Jaensch is (or was) sick, and, as he writes to me, wants to have a leave of absence. For the near term, therefore, he cannot actively pursue the most important piece of business, the matter of the new appointment. However, he would certainly like to talk things over with me personally. This is a delaying maneuver to get past me as well as the Dean,' who is very disagreeable to him, but this maneuver is so tactless that we won't fall for it. The committee will probably be scheduled to meet next week. I presume that Jaensch will become well on the spot and will appear. Hartmann is indeed at work; he was named to me directly by the Dean. Otherwise, everything is still opaque.

Here are the books from Bengt Berg' published by Dietrich Reimer, Berlin:

My Friend the Rainpiper

The Last Eagle

Abu Markub

To Africa with the Birds

Schworer has authorized the regional building office to take my plans to the higher office. Silentium about this! Now the thing can begin. As soon as there is movement on the appointment, I will let you know.

Sincere greetings from house
to house Your

Martin Heidegger

61. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, May 4, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

Sincere thanks for the books and the reviews of the bird books.

My heart is joyful that you were pleased to be with me again. It was splendid. May it be often repeated, and may we be more and more open with one another in closeness and in disparity, which can itself bcome a source of closeness.

So you will have more annoyances over the appointment. Now, you are certainly familiar with psychiatric gentleness and the attitude of kindly observation; only, hopefully, you will achieve your goal, at the very least, by a supporting Separatvotum if it doesn't work out some other way.

L. Curtius's address:
Rome, Instituto Germanico Archeologico
Via Sardegna 79

Sincere greetings and best wishes for a good semester! Your Karl Jaspers.

62. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, May 13, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

The first committee meeting was the day before yesterday. I spoke informatively about Becker,' Frank, and Baeumler,2 and Stenzel3 also came into the discussion.

Hartmann is not coming. But the committee would still like somthing better, and clearly not merely as an ornament. In the days before the first meeting, I wondered again and again whether I shouldn't put you on the list; however, since I had to tell myself that you wouldn't come to this small town, I didn't bring myself to act as if you would.

I would like to ask you again, nevertheless, in spite of the fact that I know I shouldn't ask this question. If I have no certainty that you would come, then I cannot fight.

I cannot cite to you anything that speaks for Marburg. I haven't felt at ease here for a single hour. The faculty here is the same as anywhere else-the student body heavily oriented toward exams or completely given over to fraternities. The only thing: the theolo- gians4-but this is a patchy matter. The only positive thing that would jump out for you: a higher salary-Heidelberg would have to give you up, which would mean that, at a less established place, a higher purchase price would be the option. One doesn't go from Heidelberg to Marburg as an Ordinarius-everyone says that to himself here. I have written so negatively for a reason.

I cannot persuade you. If you still say yes, then I will be doubly happy: The succession will be very honorable, and I can also intercede for you.

By the way, I also heard that you will come under consideration at Cologne. For this reason, perhaps, Hartmann was in Heidelberg.

Sincere greetings from house to house

your

Martin Heidegger

63. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, May 15, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

I thank you sincerely for your intentions and for your question. Indeed, you cannot fight for me if you know that I won't come. I thought it over again with my wife. As intensely as I wish to change my situation and to improve our financial condition, it won't work. I can't even halfway promise you that I'll eventually agree to come.

Your portrayal of Marburg is intentionally unappealing. The theologians would attract me very much, if a serious fight were possible, but they would certainly suppress themselves, as is the way with theologians. My secret desire to meet a true confessor and to be seriously put into question by him would certainly not be satisfied. I could indeed waiver momentarily when I think of a larger income, but even that would he improbable in Marburg- and, if it were offered to me, I would still be completely uncertain. Certainly, if I were to get approximately the same in Heidelberg I would stay here.

If we weren't friends, I would write, "Under very favorable conditions I would very carefully consider an offer of appointment. It is not inconceivable that I would come"-but, for you, that is already too much. Things really develop in the concrete situation only if one can consider nothing to be excluded in these mattersso it is extremely improbable that I would come to Marburg. How differently things are for me with Bonn, and even with Frankfurt and Cologne!

Thank you sincerely once again! And I wish you well in your other struggles now.

Your Karl Jaspers

64. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Marburg, June 2, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter. It is too bad that I cannot nominate you here without any real prospects that you would come; however, the situation of things, which is fundamentally hopeless, must nevertheless gradually brighten. You won't be in Heidelberg much longer. This is painful for me.

Today just the news that, on May 31, 1,000 Marks, including interest, have been sent for the time being with sincere thanks.

Then, through you, I would like to ask Frank for a more thorough characterization of his planned work. In addition, the main dates of his Vita- and indeed as soon as possible. The next and first real meeting is on June 8.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

Confidential: Becker has been nominated in second place in Kiel.

65. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]*

Heidelberg, June 4, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

Many thanks for your letter. I have received the 1,000 Marks, including interest. Frank will report to me today at noon.

In the meantime I was in Berlin. Two days after Scheler's death,2 I thought about a talk I wanted to give in my seminar, but I came to the conclusion that I couldn't give it. He was a personality. In spite of everything else, one had to respect his keenness of hearing and his intellectuality as something irreplaceable today. I will not allow myself to say anything about him in public-i.e., in conversations that do not take place among friends-but he was not a light that showed me a way; he was a will-o'-the-wisp. Above all, I could never hate him or love him. To characterize him as a phenomenon to the students, at the moment of his death, seemed hard-hearted to me. I can do it later. In death, one becomes suddenly aware of where one stands. A human being becomes something like an image as a whole. It was clear to me that Scheler will not accompany me in that human space where my heart beats. As I was thinking of this, a telegram came from Richter.3 He would be very greatful to me for a visit. I went there: greeting with appreciable respect and potential impudence. Reason: He is inviting me in the name of the Frankfurt faculty to hold a series of guest lectures there this summer semester. He has taken this occasion to ask how I feel about this. I politely declined to do the guest lectures. Then there was an hour-long discussion in the presence of Windelband, interrupted by telephone conversations. Content: What should become of philosophy in Prussia? I spoke as little as possible. For Marburg, he nominated Pichler.-but without conviction. I characterized our candidates, but naturally not as ours. I held Rothacker at a considerable distance, but I didn't radically negate him. I believe, by the way, that people soon forget what one says. They talk for the whole day. He claimed to have a very good remembrance of seven years of correspondence, and talked about my idea of the

University. Finally, he declared that he hopes to see me here very often-thus I have come no further than before, and I am very skeptical.

Dr. Jonas4 is in my seminar. A fine man! I hope to hear more from him. He only talks sense. A true student of yours!

Sincerely,

Your Karl Jaspers

66. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, June 6, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

I am enclosing the notes you requested from Frank! Hopefully you will have success!

Many thanks for the 1,000 Marks with interest!

In the meantime, I have been with Richter, who invited me by telegraph in Berlin. Conversation for an hour, "to see how I feel." Nothing real! I'll tell you about it later in person.

Dr. Jonas is in my seminar. He seems to be a fine man-a true student of yours, in whom I will continue to take pleasure!

Sincerely and in haste'

Your Karl Jaspers

67. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

[Postcard in letter envelope]

June 11, 1928

*In consideration for what follows,

I prefer to send the card with the post.

Dear Jaspers!

The bearer of this card,* Dr. Justus Schwarz,' has studied and worked with me for a series of semesters. He comes from Kroner and took his degree with Heimsoeth.2

He is working on Hegel and would presumably like to speak with you about including his work in your collection. In my opinion, his dissertation isn't good enough for this. On the other hand, a later piece work, of which I have seen a small part, would merit consideration.

As to what kind of philosophical ability stands behind it, I can't say.

Frank's situation is good. Besides him, candidates Becker, Stenzel! Ebbinghaus.

Baeumler has fallen.3

In any case, it is a good sign that you were called to Berlin. I am happy that I can look upon the wrangling that is coming with complete disinterest from the elevated corner of the realm near Jacob Burkhardt.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your Martin Heidegger

68. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

June 29, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Yesterday the following list was unanimously accepted in the faculty meeting:

I. Becker

II. pari passu: Ebbinghaus, Frank, Stenzel.

Becker will presumably go to Kiel; Ebbinghaus will hardly be offered an appointment. And Frank is well presented.

Stenzel was not to be avoided; otherwise, Frank would not have gotten through.

In haste.

With sincere greetings from house to house Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

Please let Frank know about the list, confidentially.

69. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 8, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you for the money! Enclosed is the I.O.U. Thanks as well for telling me about the list, which I have confidentially conveyed to Frank. The rankings, as you well know, are not what I would have done, and you also know why. Finally, thank you for your Cassirer review,' which I have as yet only quickly glanced at. It seems to me, in the clarity of its summary and critique, to be the model of a review, but I was surprised to see the misunderstanding of your thought that I had recently predicted to you in your own applica tion of Existenzphilosophie to primitive people.' That is one side, but I hold myself to the other.3 Yesterday, a Heidegger volume4 arrived, that you certainly also have. I haven't been able to read it yet but, from leafing through it, I saw that you were being brought together with Marxism.5

A couple of weeks ago, in my seminar,6 on the occasion of Hegel's thinking on time, I took up your discussion of Hegel7 and your book for two hours. It felt strange to bring up your name for the first time in my teaching and with such importance. Dr. Jonas gave an outstanding report on your book. The students took a lively interest. My critique8 was only superficial in regard to your book but, in regard to your Hegel presentation, it was in earnest. In the introduction and in the conlusion, where you would indeed not have wanted to give a critique of Hegel, you use Hegel only to provide contrast, but you would certainly not have needed him to do this.

In the last few weeks, I gave my Max Weber lectures,9 and I am now somewhat tired from the semester and, unfortunately, I haven't made much progress on my book.

Sincere greetings!

Your Karl Jaspers

70. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, September 24, 1928

I've been back from our trip to Riga since yesterday. My wife stayed in Marburg, in order to take care of the move at the beginning of October. I had to come here directly, as the family from Marburg who were watching our children during our absence had to leave, and the children couldn't be left alone any longer.

We will hardly be moved in by October 15, and I have to stay here until then. Therefore, this time my fall trip to visit you is somewhat in question, especially since I am behind in preparing my winter lectures.

If I can make good progress until the middle of October, and if it is still convenient for you after this time, I will try to make the trip possible again.

It was rather stressful in Riga. The boat ride from Stettin to Riga was magnificent-the sea was a mirror-so I hardly felt anything of the ocean's vastness. I must say, all in all, the sea stikes me as boring and unimportant-but that is just the one-sided impression of a mountain-dweller.

In August I quickly recovered from a very stressful semester. Just when I wanted to get to work, I came down with an inflamed cornea, and I often had to go to the clinic and couldn't strain my eyes.

Now I am hoping for a quiet time to work and for a more restful occupation in Freiburg.

How far have you come with your book?' I no longer think about the fact that a short time ago I published a so-called book2- I am only occasionally reminded of it by reviews.

Strange experiences one has there. To be sure, one never wrote for those who write reviews and the like-if at all for our shortwinded contemporaries?

How often I have read that I am the actual synthesis of Dilthey and Husserl-which others had planned long ago-with a few spices thrown in from Kierkegaard and Bergson.3

I am strengthened in my old conviction that today, with the routine practice of merely reading a lot, there is no point in publishing-except, perhaps, to improve your salary by getting an appointment offer-but, ultimately, you can allow yourself to do this only once.

This is perhaps already too much reflection on publication and its effects-it is something we don't hold in our hands, and we have to offer even accident an opportunity to occur so that one thing or another is grasped and, in its fashion, something comes of it.

But if this is to happen at all, then a person who is a philosophy professor must also be able to be a metaphysician, even if he finds it so difficult because the ambiguity is so great.

Last summer I lectured on logic4 as a metaphysics of truth, to the shock and astonishment of the students.

Freiburg will again become a test for me as to whether something of philosophy is there or whether everything gets absorbed in erudition.

For my introduction in the winter, I have taken up, in addition to other central problems (freedom, nature, history), the core question of philosophy and science-philosophy and worldviews-and, when I try to do this, I will want an especially lively discussion with you. I hope you will not run away from the neighborhood.

With sincere greetings

Your Faithful

Martin Heidegger

Likewise, sincere greetings to your wife.

71. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, October 2, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

From day to day, I hesitated to answer you because I would like to talk with you, and so much stands in the way this time. Now I have decided with a heavy heart to suggest that we forgo meeting this fall. I am somewhat pressured by the approaching semester-the details are of no interest. For your part, you are obviously in the same situation. There is nothing compelling at the moment. Let's agree to meet in the spring!

Of course the things one would like to talk about are adding up. I have discussed much with you to myself. When we see each other again, so much will have been settled, and other things will have been so decisively brought to a head with us that we will get to the principles more than before.

The sea was unfriendly to you. It may only be mirror-smooth when rest is an articulation of its life. Of course, the Baltic Sea isn't really the ocean, anyway. We were in the Alps, in Zermatt, and then at Lake Geneva. As the train makes everything possible today, I was over 3,000 meters high on the Gorner ridge, with real glaciers all around. I felt like Saussurel-as if the body of the all lay before met-but then the contingency of this monstrosity was basically no different in its rigidity than matter in a smaller dimension: like the sand on a beach between high tides. It is magnificent in the Alps, but I don't have any longing for them-that probably belongs to the nature of one who climbs. One feels somewhat insipid as a mere observer.

My book will still take a long time. It will certainly not appear in the year 1929. It goes forward backwards. The semesters interrupt a lot, but there remain several weeks during the vacations-but that isn't the main point. Until now, I have rewritten every finished section when I took them in hand again-and there are still several, if a few, parts that are not at all

written but consist of notes. I will not, in any case, speed up its publication due to an appointment offer. Because I would like to bring thoughts into this book in whose permutations it seems possible for me to live-because this is, therefore, the only book in which there is something essential for me-I want to write it as well as I can and as slowly as I can.

In the winter, I am lecturing on "Kant and Kierkegaard." I haven't actually looked at Kierkegaard since 1917 (only in the summer of 1923,3 in part, and superficially). I am looking forward to it.

I wish you well with the move into your new house. May you be happy in your own place with your wife and children! Hopefully we can visit you at some time. I would so much enjoy it-but now winter comes first.

Sincere greetings,

Your Karl Jaspers

72. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

October 30, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere best wishes! I am very happy that the appointment offer' came and in the way that it came. Now if you decide to accept, you can carry out your plans for the institute. You will see how other things look for you there.

I would be very sad if our being neighbors-which has hardly, if at all, begun-came to an end.

In any case, the appointment is something concrete for you, and I hope that the Baden ministry treats you just as nobly as I have been treated.

Heidelberg will now indeed be bereft of philosophers, and it looks like there will have to be a whole lot of room made for R.,2 etc.

Considering Becker's double rejection, I find the appointment of Rothacker3 to be a disgrace, but now the good man finally has peace, and he can develop his talent as the faculty jackass.

I very much hope that Frank gets the appointment, although I also believe that any real philosophizing has come to an end in Marburg.

I fear that Becker got very bad reviews from the well-known proceedings in Berlin-since all of his things go against the grain.

For other reasons, I am not on good terms with many myself, and the nomination would be seen as racketeering by phenomenology.

I would like to ask you, if you yourself share this judgment of Becker, to give your opinion on this matter-and on many others, if possible-to Herr Richter.

We have moved in and are living here with great joy. I now only wish that the work at the university, which, since my departure in 1923 has become incredibly darker, had some kind of meaning.

Otherwise, I must say that something is missing for me because I wasn't in Heidelberg before the semester-especially since I could have more directly celebrated your offer of appointment.

Sincere greetings to you and your wife

Your

Martin Heidegger

My wife also sends congratulations and greetings.

P.S. I only received the letter just today in the seminar.4

73. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, November 3, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

Sincere thanks for your letter. We just got back from Bonn.' There is much to tell you, but I can't yet. I am going to Berlin' on Thursday. If a lot is offered to me, we will gladly go to Bonn-but we are divided, and we are experiencing what it means not to know what you want, through this development in which reality only now clarifies itself.

I will now support Becker on every occasion, after I named him in second place as long as Frank had no appointment. When I was in Berlin-and didn't yet know about your list in Marburg-I personally only nominated Frank, Baeumler, and Becker, but I strongly recommended Frank and only characterized the two others pari passu. What the next opportunity will be in Berlin, I can't know yet. I believe, by the way, that Becker has a good chance-eventually he must still have a little patience. Rothacker has been known longer in Berlin and, as it were, reserved. I believe there was nothing extant against Becker. In Kiel, he was on a separate list of Scholzen's, but not with the majority as I was-as I heard, but not from a direct source.

In Bonn, Dyroff asked me if I knew Schirmer well.3 I: I don't know him at all. He was very surprised. There I saw your efforts that brought my candidacy into motion. I have now received the appointment offer on the basis of the Wenscher list,4 at the same time that a list from Frankfurt with me in first place5 was sent to Berlin. So I heard.

Naturally this is all confidential, please!

You will soon hear from me again-after I have been to Berlin.

Sincere greetings, as well to your wife

Your Karl Jaspers

Please send me your address so that my letters will arrive faster.

74. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, November 10, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter. Now I am seriously afraid that you will go.

You don't have a difficult choice insofar as you have here and there an open and broad milieu for philosophy according to the world-concept. Bonn has, perhaps, still greater possibilities-in any case, I liked it very much there last year. Finally, Cologne is also part of that.

I have my first week behind me and right now I can only say that the curious are many. There is something like a traveling public, with spies among them-a strange feeling, that others in my position could not have-because I know with such certainty how such a spy is sitting there-because I could also be sitting there. I surely knew that I was taking up this outpost-though it is a lost one in my deepest conviction-the Catholics have made incredible progress-there are even young Catholic Privatdozents sitting everywhere, who come here once out of necessity.

The philosophy faculty has gotten essentially worse, but perhaps it is like this everywhere.

The only thing new is that I am no longer hiding in my philosophizing. Somewhere it has pulled together.

The Frankfurters apparently did not have the courage to follow my advice. At the end of the last semester, I was asked by the Dean of the philosophy faculty,' on behalf of the committee, to make a list of three from the names: Grisebach,2 Jaspers, Kroner, Tillich,3 Wertheimer4-because there was no one from the subject discipline to ask for advice.5 It wasn't difficult-and I wrote to you that it was completely impossible to only name

you along with the rest. The only way: Jaspers unico loco-besides, Scheler said about the others that he could not have wanted them as successors.

Perhaps the Frankfurters were afraid of a new refusal and guarded against it with a full list. I had no idea that the Frankfurt thing would get so far.

I hope that you and your wife had a good time in Berlin doing other things, also.

I am very excited to hear not only about the result of your case but also anything about this visit to the ministry but, obviously, I cannot expect a long letter from you at this time and at the beginning of the semester.

Sincere greetings from your

Martin Heidegger

75. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, November 12, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

Everything is up in the air with me. From Karlsruhe,' they only speak in generalities. They are still considering an offer, but all too low,2 I fear. The wind blows lukewarm. It is otherwise in Berlin but with an offer that makes it difficult to go to Bonn; they told me it wouldn't be the last. I will quote you numbers when it is all over, but now it is too complicated.

I was invited to Frankfurt, at the same time as you, but for an oral presentation to the committee. I went and talked about many names they asked me about. The first thing they did was give me a list with 180 names!-whereupon it seemed appropriate to raise it to about 200. I never answered the question about a list of three but declared it to be the fate of a faculty as to how they react to characterizations. I had the idea that you and I should have the philosophical positions and that Wertheimer should have the one in psychology. I flirted a little with the thought, even though it appeared impossible, since you would hardly go to Frankfurt and I would go only very reluctantly. Nevertheless, the real situation of an offer would perhaps have meant something. Accordingly, I talked about you as a friend in detail and, with warmth and possible rivalry, I described a philosophizing that would only be possible with appointments in which those appointed stood in correlation to one another. In addition, I treated Frank, Becker, and Baeumler accordingly but more coolly-and still many others. Would the faculty notice this? They didn't notice it, and instead of three positions primo loco, they put our names on one list. This list, so I've heard (from an indirect source), has been sent back to Frankfurt from Berlin.

In Berlin, I asked Windelband3 about Becker. To which he answered: "In the summer, you recommended to us Frank, Becker, and Baeumler. We appointed Frank to Marburg because we do not want to allow the position to become the traditional possession of the phenomenologists. Becker will

have his turn. The current appointment of Frank is not intended to be against Becker. We also have good information about Baeumler." I didn't ask if unfavorable judgments about Becker would pertain to you, because the question seemed to me too indescrete-however, I did not have that impression; therefore, having hope for Becker seems to me to be justified.

Otherwise, there was talk in Berlin only about me and Bonn! I'll tell you about it sometime later. I was very inept, but I can be satisfied.

What you write about the lost mail moves me, especially since it is also the same situation in Bonn.

I am internally excited and restless-so it is when you don't know what you want. I will wait and see; it will certainly come. Material considerations are certainly important, but not decisiveonly to the extent that I go to Bonn with a large salary. Without that, I wouldn't attempt it. I have never felt hemmed-in in Heidelberg. In Bonn, I'm afraid of the feeling of provincial narrowness, if financial independence doesn't make possible beauty and mobility of life.

Tired in the evening-please excuse the writing and style!

Sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

76. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, December 1, 1928

Dear Heidegger!

We are staying in Heidelberg. It was a long process. There was a week when it was as good as certain that we were already in Bonn. Complete acclimation to the possibilities-on the basis of real perceptions-is the precondition for a meaningful decision. Material matters are a condition but are not decisive in themselves. I would make more in Prussia (23,300 with the addendum that I could say what I needed; it was not their last word-in Baden 20,700, but with equivalences that bring staying almost up to the same level, especially with housing') ,2 but in that case it is enough,3 and it was possible to make the decision independently of that (the combination will interest you: basic salary 14,000; housing allowance 1,700; lecture fee guarantee 5,000).4 Nevertheless, money means so much that I would have gone to Bonn for 30,000 Marks, especially since I found the institute possibilites very attractive-but I didn't want to make this shameless demand, and I also didn't want to negotiate and, therefore, I stayed with the first offer from both governments, and I have written to Berlin without getting the last word on income. The noblesse of the Baden government made this possible for me. If it had been otherwise, I would have gone the way of petty haggling. For me, it is not an unconditional requirement to avoid this. Only when there is no longer a question of living may one be noble. Or better: One can be noble when the others are also.

Now I am happy to be remaining in the same area with you. We will likely only be together if we should meet sometime in Berlinwhich is very doubtful.

Please be satisfied with these superficial communications. I naturally have very much to do and such a frightful lot to write-and now my inner life is almost washed out, but the new tranquility will make it possible to

awaken to real life again. Now everything has become so unreal, very instructive, but enough.

Sincerest greetings from both of us
to both of you

Your Karl Jaspers

77. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., December 3, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter. I am now congratulating myself that you are staying in Heidelberg. I am also glad as a Badener that the government behaved well.

In the last several days, I often thought with concern about how your decision would go. I also saw you in Bonn, but I believe that you have chosen, or kept, the better milieu, and I am convinced that in this choice you have once again chosen Heidelberg as your own.

It can no longer be the old Heidelberg of Max Weber. You must recreate it. That is not-I think-the most difficult thing, but that, in these years of real positive work, we must mostly forgo quietly honoring living examples so undividedly and youthfully. That is what brings such a strange loneliness into our existence-that mysterious standing before the authentic other, which we believe we have to bring to the age.

Perhaps these last weeks will do you good. Your own work, which at the stage of elaboration easily becomes pale and all too familiar, will gain in actuality.

I am in full swing here and don't concern myself with the stuffy milieu. It will be well if I'm left in peace.

In contrast to Marburg, there are very many young students here, and it is all the more essential what one does and how one does it.

While I have only taken one way in front of a few students, and this as slowly and definitively as possible, I am now attempting to attack the whole.

In the future, I will give a public lecture every summer on the introduction to academic studies,' in addition to the main lecture course.

Our house is now finished; even the garden is laid in. Next there will be a small dedication party. It is too bad that you and your wife can't drop in for a visit.

There is a new way to make contact, since we now have a telephone: 7104.

If the desire to chat comes over you, or the necessity of an essential conversation, this is a convenience.

Yesterday, all four of us were in the Black Forest in beautiful snow and, at times, I thought to myself, "Now if J. would stay in Heidelberg, then nothing would be missing." When we returned in the evening, your letter was there.

Today, W. Jaeger sent me his offprint of the report of the meeting of the Berlin Academy: "On the Origin and Revolution of the Philosophical Ideal of Life."2

I want to look at it in the next few days, and we must certainly talk about it sometime, even for reasons of intellectual politics.

With sincere greetings to you and your wife

I am your

Martin Heidegger

My wife also sincerely greets you both.

78. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, December 19, 1828

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you sincerely for your last letter. I have much to write to you-but there is time for that. Today I must only ask you about something in complete haste:

In our committee for the new appointment of the art historian,' Jantzen2 (Freiburg) is being very actively publicized. Several members-I among them-have a few concerns, without having sufficient information at the verification stage. He could "know German" in the purely academic sense and could be trivial in fulfilling the position. He is praised enormously by all the authorities. Could you tell me how effective his teaching is in Freiburg? Whether and how his school makes its appeal?3 Whether his effectiveness also has broad scope? so that he also contributes to historical studies in Freiburg?

We are thinking about Panofsky,4 and, furthermore, about younger people who are perhaps more independent. Everything is still undecided.

If you think it appropriate, please write two letters if necessary-one that I can give to the committee and one, if necessary, in which you tell me in a less constrained way what one doesn't gladly share with many.

I would be very thankful for an immediate reply, because-in case serious doubts about Jantzen were justified-there is danger in delay.

Sincere greetings!

Your Jaspers

79. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

December 20, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

I am happy to reply to your inquiry regarding Jantzen. I cannot judge his current teaching activities, but I can judge very well his activities from my first time in Freiburg from 1919 to 1923. At that time, I had a succession of unusually capable and open students of Jantzen continuously in my lessons.

Jantzen, from Hamburg, by nature reserved and somewhat unflappable, distinguishes himself through great objectivity and care in comprehension and judgment. If you don't know him well, he easily gives the impression of being a dry pedant, but he is fundamentally entirely different-much traveled and open to the world and, at the same time, keenly interested in fundamental questions. From many discussions about the Middle Ages, I know how energetically he works his way into general intellectual history and doesn't shy away from difficult work, medieval philosophy, for example, which doesn't lie within his field.

Jantzen belongs to those who don't just know and understand what they are talking and writing about.

In the fall, he returned from a trip to Spain and, as I noticed, had seen things from a very broad perspective.

His seminars are held in exceptionally high esteem and are not only visited by people from the guild.

From a human standpoint, very sympathetic, methodical, and decisive.

I hope to write a more detailed letter during the vacation.

With sincere greetings

Your Martin Heidegger

80. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

December 21, 1928

Dear Jaspers!

Jantzen is ordinary in every respect-he won't cause excitement and will hardly explore new paths.

I didn't write anything negative: (1) because I respect him in his own way; (2) because, externally, with four growing children, he is in a rather horrible situation (appointments to Munich and Leipzig have passed him by). Whether he will get anything out of the change in Baden is another question. Finally, he was, next to Husserl and Fabricius,' the one who intervened the most for my reappointment.

Next to the tribe of art historians, where so much is done with mere phrases and common, unfounded prattle, someone like Jantzen is far preferable to me.

Panofsky is more ingenious, more theoretically gifted, and more discerning-but, in my opinion, much more one-sided and more dogmatic in his way; I once saw him in Hamburg-to me unsympathetic.

The Germanness of Jantzen is quite harmless; as much as he is decided in his science, he is just as responsive to arguments and rational opinions.

If you don't have a younger representative who is exceptionally gifted and somewhat more certain in his development, I would prefer Jantzen unconditionally. Whether he would clearly suit the milieu in Heidelberg, I don't know, because this milieu isn't stableand it also has its darker sides.

I presume that you have received an invitation to Davos.2 I would accept, if only for the mountain skiing-theme: Kant's Critique of Pure Reason and the task of laying the foundation for metaphysics. Please come,

too, and indeed, so that we are together up in the mountains. I am supposed to speak between March 17 and 27.

I am happy that the vacation is here. We are looking forward to the cabin. Winter has set-in in the most beautiful way.

Sincere greetings from house to house

Your

Martin Heidegger

81. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, April 6, 1929

Dear Heidegger!

You will probably have returned from Davos. Now is the time when I have the chance to receive your visit. Do you have the desire to? Perhaps during the last third of the month?

There wasn't much going on with me during the last semester. I conducted my lectures,' but made progress in my work only indirectly, but now, in the vacation, I am fortunately entirely taken up with it again.

My wife is in Rome until the end of the month.

If you won't be coming, write me a longer letter and tell me what you have to recount. Otherwise, it will be better in person.

Sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

82. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, April 14, 1929

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your invitation. I am glad that I have at least received a sign of life from you again. Desire I would certainly have, but the manuscript of my Kant interpretation' must be ready by the end of the month. I have lectured on this interpretation several times and would, therefore, rather publish it myself than have it circulate in uncontrolled transcripts. That is why I am really exerting myself-and without any proper preparation for the next semester-hence, I still can't recount anything and must put you off until later, but please write again with more details.

More as soon as I'm free. Next month, I also have to print the second edition,' which I will publish as corrected. Great that you are under way!

With us, everyone is well and happy in the beautiful house in the country.

Sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

83. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]

June 20, 1929

Dear Heidegger!

This time I was really unhappy that we didn't speak at all. Since I read about the Davos meeting in the newspapers,' I would have especially liked to have heard about it directly from you. In the long time of more than a year, so much has accumulated that now much that once pressed for discussion will be forgotten or drop away. Our common dislike of writing letters, except on specifically pressing occasions, makes the all-too-long interruption of our communication painful. Hopefully in the fall!

You have begun your public career, and it seems to me that you can be satisfied with the seriousness of the discussion in which you are taken up. We must have a dialogue about the substance of these proceedings, which seems in no way negligible to me, even though you might be dissatisfied.

I thank you sincerely for your essay.3 I haven't been able to read it yet, because I've been well into my work since the New Year and have not until now allowed anything to distract me.

From my side, there would be inquiries about appointments to report. In the course of time, four people came from Erlangen, so a little document file is developing with me. How it has turned out, I don't yet know today. My candidates were also yours, as I surmise from our previous conversations: Baeumler, Becker, Ebbinghaus. To the question as to whether I would prefer Becker or Ebbinghaus, I answered that with either choice I would have the feeling of doing an injustice to the other. Becker is more proven by his accomplishments; Ebbinghaus is certainly more decisive as a man who philosophizes, and according to reports, the better teacher. If I had to decide myself, I would choose Ebbinghaus on nonobjective grounds, which pertain to personality and cannot claim any universal validity.

The real reason I am writing today is the following: Frl. Arendt graduated during the winter.` The work, on the whole, did not turn out as brilliantly as we had expected after the first part, but it is still good philosophically. (Historically the citations are sometimes questionable; corrections of obvious mistakes, where I have found them, are sometimes forgotten.) Since I didn't want to spend more than one-and-a-half days to do the work, I'm afraid that some still remain.' As an actual matter of what she methodically learned from you, the work is superb, and there is no doubt about the genuineness of her interest in the problems. Now she would like to make an application to the Emergency Society6 for a research stipend for the purpose of writing a work on Rahel Varnhagen.' In my opinion, she is destined to do this through her preparation and inclination. Would you also write a short recommendation for her? I would be very grateful to you. You can send it to me or dirctly to her: Hannah Arendt, Neubabelsberg bei Berlin. Merkurstr. 3 bei Luer. In case of the latter, please send me notification.

I won't write about our professor of art history and so much other stuff. Your letter about Jantzen left me undecided about him, although, until then, I was against him. Now, after Jantzen's refusal, everything is upside down here.

Sincerely

Jaspers

84. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, June 25, 1929

Dear Jaspers!

Sincere thanks for your letter. The recommendation you asked for is enclosed.

I am glad to have a sign of life from you and, especially, the news that things are going well in your work.

I am looking forward to the fall, for it cannot go any further thus; indeed, I philosophize to myself always with you.

I am no longer bothered with inquiries about appointments, thank God. The public existence I have fallen into here is less pleasant.

On the other hand-along with everything distasteful and what didn't fit my style-in Davos I directly and strongly experienced that being there has a point; and so one must put up with the fact that one gets talked about.

Now I am lecturing for the first time on Fichte, Hegel, Schellingl-and a world has opened up for me again, the old experience that others cannot read for you.

The first fourteen days of August will probably be inconvenient to you for a visit.

Not especially for me but, at the time, my wife will be at Lake Starnberg with the children and I can't go to the cabin alone.

Please write soon about this.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

Please close the envelope for the recommendation.

85. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 7, 1929

Dear Heidegger!

Sincere thanks for your letter and recommendation. I am very glad that we will see one another in the fall and also impatient that it may be soon. In spite of this, the first half of August did not go well with me. I would prefer the end of the vacation for, if I can work, I would like to complete a chapter, the only one whose fundamental idea I can't yet clearly see, even though there is a lot of material in which it appears. This is what constantly interests me now, and it must emerge before I will be open to anything else. If I can't do this, then I would like to completely relax for a little while with nature or visit my parents.

In the winter I will be on leave, probably for the last time in my life, but it will take at least a year before I can publish my work.

I heard here that you published an address in honor of Husserl's birthday.' Shouldn't I have it?

Herrigelz has been appointed to Erlangen. He was in fourth place. I gave urgent warning. For this result, the faculty there deliberated for half a year.

Yesterday there was once again havoc and a stifling atmosphere at a meeting of the big senate here: the selection of a Rector under contest.3 We were defeated. The good is mostly in the minority. It is an alarming question as to how it can gain the majority without getting denatured in the process.

Sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

86. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 14, 1929

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you very much for your Kant book' and your Husserl address. Until now I have only been able to fleetingly glance at the book, and I am looking forward to reading it. It is clearly a completely new interpretation, closed within itself, unfamiliar, and without relation to what Kantian philosophy means to me, but nevertheless productive in relation to structures in Kant which seem to me-at first impression-to be violently overemphasized-which is no defect in itself. But we must talk-the stuff has increased once again. I have a few impertinent questions about the Husserl address.'

Sincerely

Your Karl Jaspers

87. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

July 30, 1929

Dear Jaspers!

I agree about using the recommendation.' In haste!

With sincere greetings

Your Martin Heidegger

88. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Wiesbaden, October 8, 1929

Dear Jaspers!

I will come to you from Frankfurt, where I will be for a few days with Riezler (Marienstr. 1),' on October 13 or 14. If this is inconvenient for you, or if you prefer later, send me a message at the Frankfurt address.

I was in Cologne at the invitation of Frau Scheler,2 in order to look through Max Scheler's literary remains.

With sincere greetings to you and your wife.

Your

Martin Heidegger

89. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Oldenburg,' October 10, 1929

Dear Heidegger!

I thank you sincerely.

Unfortunately, I am not now in Heidelberg. I sent word to you about this by telegraph. I can't leave my parents2 any sooner-perhaps after a couple of days-but it won't go for your return trip from Frankfurt.

I hope that you can still visit me shortly before the semester begins. It would he very painful if it didn't happen again this time. I would have the last ten days of the month free for you, whenever and for however long you wish.

Sincere greetings, from my wife as well

Your K. Jaspers

90. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg-Zahringen, October 18, 1929

Dear Jaspers!

I thank you for your letter. I have thought again and again as to how a visit in Heidelberg could come about, but I cannot and do not want to stay in Frankfurt until the twentieth. Besides, this semester we are beginning classes already on October 24, by decision of the senate (I myself voted for this in the senate).

Today, I received an invitation to give a lecture from the German Association at the University of Heidelberg. I will accept for December 5 or 6, and then perhaps I can stay with you for two days. That is at least a small and temporary substitute. I will deal with the theme of my inaugural lecture:' "What is Metaphysics?"

I had no idea that you would be in Oldenberg at this time and, therefore I didn't write sooner.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your

Martin Heidegger

91. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, October 21, 1929

Dear Heidegger!

I am very glad that you are coming at the beginning of December. Hopefully, nothing will prevent it. The German Association deserves high praise.

I wish you a good semester!

Enclosed is the postage due from you for this letter.

92. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, December 1, 1929

Dear Jaspers!

I am arriving in Heidelberg next Thursday at 12:41. If it is okay with your wife and you, I would like to stay until Sunday.

With sincere greetings from house
to house

Your

Martin Heidegger

93. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, December 2, 1929 (Postmark)

Dear Heidegger!

Your lecture is on the fifth. I would be very grateful to you for a brief notice as to when you arrive and how long you can stay with us. Your room will certainly be the best heated. Do you have any requests?

With sincere greetings, in joy of finally
seeing you again

Your Karl Jaspers

Please stay as long as possible! Until we see you again! And greetings to you all!

Gertrud Jaspers

94. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, December 2, 1929 (Postmark)

Dear Heidegger!

My card went out a few hours ago. Now I have already received the most essential answer to my questions. We are very much looking forward to Sunday.

As usual, no one will be at the station. We will wait for you here in our house.

Sincerest greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

95. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

December 5, 1920

Dear Heidegger!

I cannot think of a time when I listened to anyone as I did to you today. I felt as if I were free in the pure air of this incessant transcending. I heard in your words, at times strange to me, but as identical, what is so completly self-understood between us. There is still philosophizing!

Good night!

Most sincerely

Your Karl Jaspers'

96. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., March 29, 1930

Dear Jaspers!

Yesterday afternoon I received, out of the blue, a telegraphed offer of appointment to Berlin.'

I am asked to go there on April 7 for negotiations. I would be very grateful to you if before my trip, which will probably take place on April 5, I could thoroughly discuss this with you.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your faithful

Martin Heidegger

97. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, March 29, 1930

Dear Heidegger!

I just read in the newspaper that you have received the call to Berlin. I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart. To you has not only fallen the greatest honor granted to a university philosopher; you will take up the most visible post and, in so doing, will experience and assimilate impulses of your philosophizing that are hitherto unknown. I believe there is no better opportunity.

That I once hoped for Berlin myself makes me feel a soft pain, but it is the slightest possible, since you now have gotten the call. For the consciousness that, for once, the right thing is happening, that at this moment it is absolutely unobjectionable and well deserved that you hold this effective possibility, this is such a positive joy that the pain, as something entirely personal and private, ceases to have any effect and, even at the outset, is already disappearing.

Will I also speak with you in Heidelberg when you are on your way to Berlin? I would be very happy if your arrangements made it possible.

With sincere greetings and best wishes!

Your Karl Jaspers'

98. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, March 30, 1930

Dear Heidegger!

I am very glad that you will visit me before Berlin. Please let us know when you will arrive.

Most sincerely

Your Karl Jaspers

99. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, April 1, 1930

Dear Jaspers!

Thank you sincerely for your letter.

That I am coming to you before the negotiations in Berlin should tell you that I am not taking this trip as a private matter.

I am coming on Friday at 11:09 and will resume the trip on Saturday at 13:02.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your Martin Heidegger

100. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

April 2, 1930

Dear Jaspers!

If it is okay with you, I will come to you tomorrow (Thursday) evening at 8:30.

If this isn't convenient, then please notify me by 4:00 in the afternoon.

Until I see you again

Your

Martin Heidegger

101. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, May 17, 1930

Dear Jaspers!

I can't report anything new to you but only say what I have already confided to you out of the sentiment of friendship. A few days ago I declined the call to Berlin.

From the beginning, the offer took the course that we considered to be essential. Above all, the lecture-fee guarantee was independent of the number of students in the class. It would even be up to me as to whether I lectured for one or two or four hours per week. In addition, no obligations.

The Baden government could naturally not match this, which I also did not request, but it still made every effort. Neverthless, from the very beginning, the whole thing was for me never a question of offer and counteroffer.

I immediately had a long discussion with the minister, who made an excellent impression. He also directly instructed me on the previous history of the appointment offer. The faculty had unico loco nominated Cassirer. Hartmann refused and nominated me-but expressed reservations about youth, and so on.

Thus they wanted to add to the four mediocrities and inferiors a fifth who was harmless.

It has now become downright fatal to be expressly nominated by a Berlin faculty.

Confidentially. After it was over with the appointment offer, several members of the faculty, among them Jaeger, discovered that they actually would have wanted me-but the bigwigs. It is not for the first time that I

doubt whether such cowards are the right people to help a new humanism get to its feet.

While the whole thing caused me no internal disturbance, there was still a lot of inconvenience and unnecessary rumoring around.

After the effective refusal, the minister attempted in a long letter to find a new way to attract me to Berlin. To this end, he wants to send Richter to me in Freiburg for another conference.

By the way, Richter received me in Berlin with the greeting: "So we see each other again!" I would prefer that he stay in Berlin, and I will gladly do without the satisfaction; it would even be painful for me.

During Whitsun week, my wife and I want to go paddling with friends on the Main or the Weser or the Heidel stream. If this occasion arises, we can perhaps look in on you.

With sincere greetings and best wishes for the completion of your work

Your Martin Heidegger

Many greetings also to your wife.

My wife also sends greetings to you both.

102. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, May 24, 1930

Dear Heidegger!

Sincere thanks for your letter. Your final refusal moved me once again. I am subsequently coming to understand from your position. The certainty of your decision leaves no doubt that you have chosen rightly. What philosophically still sleeps within you, and only you can feel, can come to light better here in the south, in one of the oases of the present-day desert. In spite of this, I am not indifferent to the fact that philosophizing in Berlin, in view of present reality and its danger, will not happen. From your side, there is a renunciation and a demand whose final meaning I don't yet grasp. Something good will come of this. I wish you the best for your work on the rudiments you have so decisively seized upon.

At this moment, your decision has an objective meaning for our German University in general. It will have, for many, the suggestion: Berlin is sinking in value, the small universities are rising. I don't believe one quickly forgets this.

Now Heidelberg remains for you.' If you ultimately really wish it, I will do everything with your help to get you here. It would perhaps be expedient to begin immediately. The difficulty is Hoffmann, who, unfortunately, has a large part of the faculty behind him. But perhaps encircled from the beginning, he has declared himself in your favor. The other difficulty is Karlsruhe,' where, financially, you probably have the advantage over Cassirer, since they can call someone cheaper to Freiburg in your place-if Karlsruhe will at all maintain three Ordinariats in Heidelberg who were not planned and were never approved by the provincial legislature. These are all things we can talk about later.

Among all the possibilities, your coming to Heidelberg would naturally be for me the only one that means anything. It would determine whether we

are both in position to philosophize communicatively and in the most radical discussion or whether the old solipsistic way will continue as it always was at the universities: where there was only polemic and no actualization, and where one didn't get too close. It would become, for us, like a trial of Existenzphilosophie, which one can nevertheless not directly will or accomplish. If this reaches the situation of being publicly known as a movement to be realized over several years, there would be in philosophizing a new verification and an exhortation to others that could establish something in reality. If it doesn't succeed, the pain would be for me and, I believe, also for you, of a particular nature. A fear of this certainly puts into question my wish for a local partnership. In Berlin, it would be entirely different than in the dangerous closeness of the general public in a small town. The difficulties are great, but success is all the more essential.

Whether the decline of Heidelberg could be halted by your coming here, one cannot say. It is essentially a matter only of appointments and habilitations. We have experienced many refusals (Buschor,3 Panofsky4). If you come, there would probably be an elevation of the status of Heidelberg in common opinion. Most of the time, we are brought down by those who are devoted to appointing mediocrities. They are in the majority. If you were to come, perhaps a solidarity of two (in which we could probably always count on Weber and Gundolf as virtually certain) could have a power that, until now, I have been acquainted with only momentarily-but I cannot be depended upon physically, and how long I will live is also a consideration for you. The plan for an aristocractic university, which we talked about recently, is, for the time being, utopian, but we do not have to let it drop completely. If the Reich really wants a Reich's university, then there might be a chance. You would then be indispensable, for, in such a case, the politically decisive problems will depend upon the role the Catholics play. In this, we are all children here, while you know all about it and will perhaps find the recommendations that will satisfy the Center5 and not ruin the university.

When I think upon the possibility of your coming here, I experience a vitality that strengthens the wish-but then I think about your silence in our

conversations, and I long most of all for the mutual and radical discussion that took place earlier but now rests for so long. For a year, to be sure, the blame rests essentially with me. An elaboration is like a kind of slave labor that one must complete in order to be free once again. If illness and the like don't get in the way, I believe I will he finished with it in the winter.

Your letter found me in bed. After a nine-month break, the lectures made my bronchia resistant to treatment; neverthless, I was able to hold out without collapsing. Now I am using the first free day to answer you. We are very much looking forward to you and your wife's visit during the Whitsun vacation. Hopefully, your plans still make it possible.

Sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

103. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 5, 1930

Dear Heidegger!

Filling the position of the Extraordiariat in Roman studies is now acute here. Would you then, as immediately as possible, write your view of Rheinfelder,l about the man, his teaching effectiveness, his inaugural lecture, etc.? I heard your opinion that you communicated to Bessler.2 I would like to submit your letter to the committee. It will probably be decisive, at least this is what Olschki3 said, speaking for himself. The usual mechanism-the cheapest way for the government-presses toward Rheinfelder.

Sincere greetings

Your K. Jaspers

104. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 13, 1930 (Postmark)

Dear Heidegger!

You still haven't answered me; therefore, I am writing you that, in any case, the committee meeting in which the final decision will be taken is on Wednesday.

With sincere greetings

Your K. Jaspers

105. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, July 15, 1930

Dear Jaspers!

Yesterday I had a lecture in Karlsruhe and, until then, I let everything else be forgotten and left undone, so now I am coming with the answer, perhaps too late.

Naturally, I cannot judge Rheinfelder professionally. I have seen the habilitation, where one can already get most of it from the wording of the curriculum vitae. I don't mean the content of the life history. In addition, I have become acquainted with Rheinfelder and have asked around about him.

His teaching effectiveness is very great, reckoned by the numbersbut there it is a question of mere cramming and the cheap opportunity to hoard seminar certificates. Rheinfelder fulfills this task perfectly. He has great zeal and doesn't otherwise need to make any demands on those dreadful dime-a-dozen products of the new philologists.

According to what I know of him and what I have heard about him, he couldn't do it, anyway. His inaugural lecture was by nearly all accounts simply pitiful. Something was supposed to have been said about the intellectual personality, and we specifically asked for the general theme-whereupon the candidate not only constantly proved that he had learned a not-very-difficult craft in a simpleminded way and, with its help, had arrived at so-called results of research but took the opportunity to convince the faculty that the living world, whose literature and language he was supposed to be dealing with, moved him personally.

Rheinfelder got this opportunity, but the faculty did not get any discernable trace of any kind of living relationship. I wouldn't want to

demand for a minute that this living relationship should be an original one, which could give impulses to research.

Not once did the specifically Catholic world of Pascal receive any kind of illumination by Rheinfelder, who is a believing Catholic. Simply pitiful.

In this, as in other cases, the question of need played a role. Without such a crammer, the business is no longer to be mastered. To he sure.

Behind this, however, stands the question: Should the philosophy faculty become a cram-institute for language teachers with the free addition of dubious aesthetic broths-or something else? It has become clear to me from recent experience: The habilitation and appointment of such candidates as Rheinfelder-who will be enthusiastically celebrated, for sure, in the pertinent regional papersmay no longer be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, because then the thing is already lost; if there is more to philosophy faculties than promoting a business, these candidates must be cut off a limine. And why then-with might and main-fill every open position, and why precisely with such who wear the proper little frock? Ask why the math. natural sci. [faculty] in Gottingen can maintain themselves at such a high level, because they risk even making a double appointment in one area, or appointing a representative from a completely different discipline-just as long as he is a personality.

What will become of such a generation of Romanists-and it is just as bad in other areas-when the faculties act in this way? But perhaps Herr Rheinfelder is today already a great Romanist.

That must be decided by your specialists.

Sincere greetings

Your M. Heidegger

106. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

May 19, 1931

Dear Jaspers!

An external matter is the reason for these lines. The deliverer, Prof. Myake,' is not one of the many curious Japanese, but a serious worker. Perhaps you can find a few moments for him.

Otherwise, I want to keep quiet and wait until you are done with your work.

People are certainly asking about it; but I am always happy not to know anything.

May you succeed in completing it. The greater the noise around my name, the more alone I live with my work. In August, the whole family is going to Spiekeroog.2

With sincere greetings also to your wife

Your Martin Heidegger

107. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, July 24, 1931

Dear Jaspers!

I come today with a hasty request. Becker has just received a call to Bonn.

I need an immediate replacement to fill the Assistant position; otherwise, it will be taken away from me.

I don't have any real pupils, and I really wish for something different. I have thought about Brock,' who made a very good impression on me at Whitsun, and could now easily unhabilitate himself, but I don't want to deal with this entirely on my own.

You know him, certainly.

Please write me something of your own about him-if this isn't completely inconvenient for you.

With sincere greetings also to
your wife

Your

Martin Heidegger

With his shameless Heidelberg tradition' (which is pathetic), Rickert will probably want to publicly commit himself for the coming political battle over appointments.

108. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, July 25, 1931

Dear Heidegger!

Becker's appointment to Bonn is very gratifying. Please convey to him my sincere congratulations.

I simply can't write anything about Brock. Although I have known him for ten years, I ultimately don't know anything about him. He is one of the very few who have interested me in the long run.

First of all: He has learned something. His medical studies, which he took to completion after beginning his studies in philosophy, as he already lived in an educational world, have given him much sense for actuality and a sense of scientific methods. He knows what science is. Despite this, he is not at all a medical man, has no inclination to be a physician, but, on the contrary, from the beginning and all during his studies, he has actually only been moved by philosophy.

Then: He has an extraordinary capacity for empathy, gets almost uncannily and knowingly close to people and, in this, has at least touched upon something critical-for his dealings with others was not secondary to him but, I believe, an unsettling experience that, as it seems, has made him solitary, athough he has good friends and relationships with first-rate people. He has a sure feel for level. He distinguishes himself from the overlarge majority because he has entered the space where all veils fall away and actual seriousness first becomes possible.

My high estimation of him has one limitation. I certainly do not doubt his seriousness or his decency, but a dangerous overreaching and sudden failure is possible with him. The ballast that always keeps the ship upright is not great in his case. If you do not take the term as a curse word but as

the expression of a gift and a danger at the same time: He has a side that strikes me as hysterical.

As to what pertains to his capacity for philosophical craftsmanship, I have nothing to say. He can certainly learn a lot, for he has indeed always philosophized but has not always studied philosophy. I expect something from him because he has something real in his heart and in his head.

Several years ago (I believe 1927), Brock was with me and wanted to take his degree under me with the unspoken intention to habilitate later on. At that time, I advised him against it; first, because I didn't want to risk sharing the responsibility if he wanted to immediately break off after completing his medical studies, with no attempt to practice and without any scientific medical work; and second, because his chances for philosophy would be greater if he took his degree somewhere else and habilitated there. He took my refusal very hard then and has probably not completely forgiven me for it, but he accepted it and has remained faithful to me.

In the summer of 1929 he was in Heidelberg again. This time he was known here, because he philosophically annihilated Mannheim in the latter's seminar. I had great joy in every conversation with him. He understands the latest things, and the slightest allusion finds in him an accommodating understanding.

He has the advantage of being no one's pupil. There is a free atmosphere around him.

If I had an assistantship to fill, I would certainly choose Brock from among all of the young people I know at this time.

Rickert's writing is also certainly meant by him to be a suggestion as to his successor.' I recently told Hoffman that an appointment would only interest me if you or Cassirer were also considered; otherwise, we wouldn't need anyone. Hoffmann agreed. Cassirer wouldn't come because the State of Baden cannot spend 30,000 Marks for a new professor. Presumably, the Baden savings program will prevent every appointment in areas that are multiply occupied.

You are going to Spiekeroog, the island beloved by my father and our entire family! I hope you will feel well there.

I am staying at home until my manuscript is ready to be printed. An advance text2 (a kind of concrete preface) is set and will probably appear in September. Then I also hope to be able to send the book to the printer soon.

With sincere greetings, also to your wife

Your Karl Jaspers

109. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., December 20, 1931

Dear Jaspers!

Only today, and for Christmas, comes this letter of thanks for the gift that you have given me with your great work and its smaller forerunner.'

Until now, I could only occasionally read in the Metaphysics, and indeed from behind in both of the last chapters. I need a long time in order to comprehend and only understand when my own necessities force me to come to terms with something.

Because I somehow already agree with you, I can at first say less about it than others.

I do not want to bring forward incidental reservations and lagging objections that for the most part are probably due to unfamiliarity with the whole.

It remains essential that, with your work, there is finally in philosophy today something indispensable and whole. You speak from the clear and decisive comportment of the victor and from the richness of one who has been existentially tested.

The work will indirectly bring to light the hidden powerlessness of the weak and merely clever, make humble all genuine but small strivers, and quicken those unknown to us who have gotten a task.

Now that the work has arrived, I am only sad about one thing: that it wasn't known when the Berlin appointment was made.

You now have not only the foundation, the richest horizons and the certainty of comportment, but also the unequivocal courage to really stand

there. In lieu of this, only another insignificant one is added to the superfluities who already exist.

Many silent readers who may come into the effective field of your work will help plow the ground, and so work upon the renewal that you have guided.

What they will write about it must remain of no importance, for even these utterances fall under the secret force of the indispensable.

May the joyfully animated relaxation after the completion of this step make you ready for the second decisive step of the knowing leader and guardian into the real public realm.

Your work also gives me confirmation after the fact that I did right for two years by not disturbing you. Besides, I would have had nothing to say-because for a long time now-already before the Berlin episode-I am shocked over my dubious success2 and I have known ever since that I have dared to go too far beyond my own existential power and without clearly seeing the confines of what is materially in question for me.

Since then, I exist in the role of an overseer in a gallery, who, among other things, has to see to it that the curtains in the windows are correctly opened and closed so that the few great works of the tradition are more or less properly illuminated for the randomly gathering spectators. Without the picture-I only read and work on the history of philosophy; i.e., I attempt to lay out what seems important to me for loosening up philosophizing without considering the economy of the lecture. As a half-Swabian, I have now attained Swabian adulthood, where you become clever enough to know what you can and may do, and what not.

Everything is fine with my wife and the boys. All three came back from Spiekelroog in highest delight and very invigorated.

Brock is very eager, conscientious, and still a bit too excitable and insecure; he takes the Heideggerizing cackle of a few fellowtraveling pupils too seriously.

Tomorrow we are going to the cabin for the entire vacation. There will be the snowstorm once again, and the howling of the foxes in the snow-covered woods, and the high night sky, and the solitary excursions in the quiet, high valleys.

I send sincere greetings to you and your wife.

In true friendship

Your

Martin Heidegger

110. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, December 24, 1931

Dear Heidegger!

In reading your letter, I felt the unusual happiness of hearing a word that is relevant and affirming to me. The friendly disposition with which you received my published things allows me to hope that something will still happen between us. Twelve years ago-so it seems to me-a just-flickering ray was, perhaps, barely visible in my Psychology of Worldviews. Over the years I thanked you for your critical attitude and affirmation of the possible. You were the only colleague in the field who knew what I did not succeed in. Then, when in Being and Time a small flame was really visible, it was so disposed that the reader could be diverted by the cinders and ashes of phenomenology, because they bind together like a constructive steel frame into what you call Heideggerizing. If I should now be able to ignite a second little flame, then no more than that. My work is very incomplete; the strength of my thinking extends to no more than momentary insights, and only the patience to slowly twist something and then something else out of what always sinks away, to be satisfied with droplets, allows a book to coalesce, which yet must remain full of inconsistencies. Our matter is lost when it is dogmatized and stands as a work; therefore, I don't feel like a victor, as your friendly but dangerously distancing formula puts it, but as if I stand before the door, as if what is extraordinary would still have to become revealed, as if I can't do enough to grasp it in thought-I am disregarding the rare moments of my life-as if, nevertheless, the unified power of something that is intimated and slipping away will be able to hold. The form for publicness would not be a work that would contain truth, but the movement of a confrontation that would bring communicative critique instead of polemics into the philosophical world for the first time. I would have to open up your Being and Time, and you would have to do the same to my book, in such a way that the core and the potentiality first begin to genuinely shine forth from what has been destroyed: That is what unifies us

from the outset. On this basis, then, we would have to continue our exchange and then put the whole thing before the public as a joint effort-but one cannot directly will something like this; it can result.

In the last years, a sadness lay over my relationship with you. To my letter from the spring of 1930,1 regarding the possibility of your coming to Heidelberg-a letter out of concern and fear, which wanted to be dissipated with a word: I did not believe I received any other answer than, "We have no corporate business," the word that you said to me at Whitsun2 apropos of Sternberger3 and that I couldn't forget, because it seemed to be suited for the letter, about which I otherwise heard nothing. But I was mistaken. For that reason, the mere possibility of the other is now as good as enough for me.

I will hardly be able to take the path into the true public realm. The physical causes of my limitations are not to be changed. In the long run, and in all probability, philosophy in the German universities is in your hands. As long as I live, I will only be able to work with pen and paper. It is deeply painful to me and only repeats the way it has been my whole life: that I can't enter into the world, may not, in the living present, embrace men and let them embrace me.

What you write about your work-exclusively in the history of philosophy-I also claim for myself. My philsophy doesn't want to present itself as new next to the old. Like you, I feel that I serve the great. My philosophy wants to be, as I say somewhere within it, an organon for the appropriation of these great ones, nothing more. The more is for both of us the meaning and consciousness of this appropriation, and the possibility of a new critique and communication. That is what you earlier understood to be a commentating philosopher, one who, alone in our time, could penetrate into the texts and come to have a feeling for the origin; only late did I transfer this from the pain of being left alone, and then from success in communication into my occupation with philosophical works. We have agreed with one another in this for a long time-I believe this, despite your Kant book.4

I am glad that you write with kindness about Brock.

It will be unforgettably beautiful in your cabin. Now, if I could meet you sometime in the high valleys at the edge of the woods!

In sincere regard

Your K. Jaspers

I am sending you at the same time a notice about me in the Frankfurt newspaper,5 which I immediately put in an envelope when the girl brought me your letter.

111. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, December 8, 1932

Dear Jaspers!

Your new publication' is grand, beautiful, simple, and clear. A dialogue with M. W.2 while thankfully catching your breath after completing your great work.

This brings to mind: You should now bring out a work next to Philosophy, which would be called Philosophers. It would be entirely different from the usual history of philosophy and perhaps the most effective Logic of Philosophy. I am also happy for another reason. There is today so little that one can admire and where one can detect spiritual engergy at work, and whoever attempts to awaken the greatness of the ancients uses up his entire strength until the picture comes into being, if he even succeeds at all.

I admittedly do not know M. W.3 well enough, and he will probably remain a stranger to me until the end. I presume that there is something else in your work. I say presume because I have not actually worked through it and made it ripe for an inner confrontation with me. The experiences I have had with the opinions of others toward my own corpus make me even more cautious. I don't believe I am capable of really grasping the genuinely creative essentials of such a work, but one day I must succeed.

I am somewhat more hopeful again about my own attempts, for it has now finally gone so far that I will be unanimously rejected by the entire line of what calls itself philosophy. The uproar has passed, and I feel that I am back in the pleasant anonymity from before 1927.

I devoted the last year entirely to the Greeks and, even in this sabbatical semester, they aren't letting me go. The little that is my own becomes more and more hazy to me in this keen air. Will it succeed in providing

philosophy with ground and space for decades to come? Will there be men who carry within themselves a distant readiness?

When will you give the Freiburg lecture? It would be important for many reasons if you were to come.

I thank you for the little book and with sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

112. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, March 10, 1933

Dear Heidegger!

You still haven't received an answer from me to your letter in which you so affirmatively thank me for my piece on Max Weber. Today, I only want to tell you how very happy you made me, but I would especially like to ask you if you want to visit me once again during this vacation. We haven't spoken in such a long time-the last times were only like greetings in their shortness-that we need a jolt to bring us into contact again. As this only occurred before in conversation and not through our writings, it will probably remain this way in the future. When writings have the tendency to alienate, spoken words must bind us together all the more. Finally, we are certainly more than what we write. I would be very happy if you would decide to do this. Any time in March would be convenient for me, better than in April.

With sincere greetings from house to house

Your Karl Jaspers

113. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., March 16, 1933

Dear Jaspers!

I thank you sincerely for your letter and the invitation. In these weeks in March, my sabbatical work is coming to an end. Since we are expecting a visit at the end of March, and I need April to prepare for the semester, I would like to come to see you immediately. If there is no opposing reply from you by Friday evening, I will leave early on March 18 with the express train and will be in Heidelberg at 9:52.

I would like to be there incognito, so as not to fritter away time or good spirits.

With sincere greetings from house
to house

Your

Martin Heidegger

114. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., April 3, 1933

Dear Jaspers!

I still hoped to get some kind of definite reports on the plans for reforming the universities. Baeumler is keeping quiet; his short letter gives the impression he is angry. From Krieck' in Frankfurt, there is likewise nothing to be heard. Karlsruhe isn't stirring.

On April 6 a meeting of the syndicate of philosophy faculties is supposed to take place. The representative from here is Schade- waldt.2 Who is being sent from Heidelberg is unknown here.

Perhaps on this occasion there will be something to be gathered from the representative from Berlin. A syndicate based in Frankfurt-and determined by Krieck-will falter just the same.

Our Rector,3 with whom I have spoken, is only horrified by the inaction of the Rectors' conference.

I am very grateful to you for the days in Heidelberg-they would certainly have been even more fruitful had I made your Philosophy directly accessible to myself in its concretion. On the other hand, I got important hints out of our conversations. It seems to me that, in regard to our old points of contention, a common understanding is in the offing from both sides and from entirely different paths.

To do the job of a commentator I admittedly need much time and effort so that, most of the time, essential reflections come about only ad hoc.

So much is so dark and questionable that I sense more and more that we are extending into a new reality and that an age has grown old.

Everything depends on whether we prepare the right point of engagement for philosophy and help it find the right words.4

If I find time to dictate the Parmenides interpretation, I will send it.

With sincere greetings from house to house in old friendship

Your

Heidegger

115. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, April 20, 1933

Dear Heidegger!

I gladly think back to those days with you. I thank you that we were once again privately together. In quiet moments that I shall not forget, you let me see into your depths, as indeed you had many times before, but now-through confirmation and repetition-it is more important to me.'

The desire to philosophize has unfortunately not come to fruition with me. In the meantime, I was in Berlin-troubles with a relative'-we came back tonight. I didn't hear anything about the universities, but I did perceive the atmosphere in Berlin as things look from German-national and Jewish circles. I was pleased with the courage but didn't see the real spiritual trend.

Now I am finally getting to work for the semester. It will have to be better than anything I have ever done before.

Let me hear from you again!

I would like very much to hear about the Parmenides interpretation or the explanation of the allegory of the cave.

Sincere greetings in the spirit of friendship

Your Karl Jaspers

I thank you sincerely for your letter. You are moved by the timeso am I. What actually lies hidden within it must show itself.

116. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

[Freiburg i. Br.] May 24, 1933

Dear Jaspers!

Unfortunately, I can't come to Heidelberg, because I still have something important I have to prepare for the University Day on June 1.

Sincere greetings from house to house in haste

Your

Heidegger

117. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, June 23, 1933

Dear Heidegger!

I hear that you are giving a lecture next Friday in Heidelberg.' If this is true, I would be very happy. In any case, I would like to immediately invite you to stay with us.'

Sincere greetings

Your K. Jaspers

118. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, June 25, 1933

Dear Jaspers!

My lecture will take place on Friday. I will be in Heidelberg about five o'clock. I thank you for the invitation and accept very gladly. Hopefully, I can arrange my work here so that I can still be in Heidelberg on Saturday.

Sincere greetings

Your

M. Heidegger

119. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Heidelberg, August 23, 1933

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you for your Rectoral Address.' It was nice to see it in its authentic version after reading about it in the paper. The great stroke of your inception in the early Greeks affected me again like a new, but at the same time obvious, truth. In this, you come together with Nietzsche, but with the difference that one may hope that you will at some point realize, through philosophical interpretation, what you are saying. In this respect, your address has genuine substance. I am not talking about style and density, which-as far as I can see-makes this address the only document until now of an actual academic will and one which will last. My trust in your philosophizing, which since our conversations in the spring has renewed in strength, is not disturbed by the qualities of this address that are of the time, by something in it that strikes me as a little forced, and by statements that seem to have a hollow ring. All in all, I am only happy that someone can speak in such a way that he touches upon genuine limits and origins.'

Enclosed is the transcript you wanted to see and which I ask you to destroy (proposal by the leader of the student body).3

At the end of July and the beginning of August, I composed a document to give you some suggestions about reforming medical studies,' but it will only work with a train of thought that embraces the entire university; detached, individual suggestions have no meaning, because only the spirit in which they are made and carried out gives them this meaning. For this reason, I did not at all deal with medicine itself. The document-jotted down and not revised-I am leaving in the desk. I am not sending it to you. I will show it to you when you visit me next time, if you are interested.

Yesterday our new university constitution' was in the paper. It is an extraordinary step,' because I know from my own experience how the

outgoing constitution works, and because for years I have consciously withheld all initiatives because everything fails against this wall, I cannot do otherwise than to find the new constitution right. Regretting that a great age of the university, whose end we have known for a long time, is now visibly and drastically ended is the pain of a piety that I do not deny myself. The new constitution seems well formulated to me. Only, in my opinion, an important point is missing: Whoever has such powers at his disposal would also have to take responsibility for mistakes, of character or of insight, in his actions-if the constitution is to accomplish something in the long run. The form in which a critique of appearances and of actions can come to a deciding court of appeal is, it seems to me, not laid down. Written assertions of opinion by advising members of the faculties7 are spendid, but what if no one knows about them, and what if they aren't even asked for? The constitution will certainly have to be corrected and expanded if it is to prevent, over a period of years, the development of a racket in intrigue, dependent upon particular circumstances. The first test will be to what extent the leaders of all ranks, those designated by each subordinate one, possess the gift of discerning spirits. I wish success to this aristocratic principle.

I would be very happy if it were possible for you to come over to Heidelberg once again in October. Much has happened in the meantime, and much has become clear. I would like to speak with you, if you are interested in knowing my concrete experiences and opinions.

I hope your canoe trip with your son went well. The hot weather was, perhaps, excellent for such closeness to nature?

Sincere greetings

Your K. Jaspers

120. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., July 1, 1935

Dear Jaspers!

On my desk lies a portfolio with the inscription Jaspers. Now and then, a note flies into it; letters that I have begun also lie within it. Pieces of a discussion on the occasion of the first attempt to grasp the third volume of Philosophy-but it's still nothing to get excited about, and now come your lectures,' in which I surmise the forerunner of the Logic. I thank you sincerely for this salute, which pleases me very much, for my solitude is almost complete. Someone told me, incidentally, that you are working on a Nietzsche book; thus I can be happy about how much the stream has stayed with you even after the great work.

With me it is-to say something about it-a laborious groping about. Only a few months ago, I again reached the conclusion of the work sketched out in the winter of 1932-33 (sabbatical semester), but it is a thin stammering and, besides, two thorns-the confrontation with the faith of the tradition and the failure of the Rectorat-already contain enough of what must actually be overcome.

The obligatory expression in the lectures is exercised in interpretations, but that is only a new occasion to experience how far away the possibilities for real thinking are.

Life here-half in the country-the weeks at the cabin, the boys getting big (Jorg, the eldest, is in the Lietzschen State Educational Institution at Castle Bieberstein and is doing splendidly)-all of that is fine.

In Sincere Friendship

Your

Martin Heidegger

The enclosed Sophocles translation, which came about this summer on the occasion of my lectures,' is intended as a wish for a small return gift.

Sophocles, Antigone V. 332-375.

polla to deina ...

1. Strophe-The manifold uncanny holds sway And nothing uncannier than man; He fares forth upon the foaming tide amid winter's southerly tempest and cruises among the deep, opening swells. He wearies as well the noblest god, the earth, the indestructible, the tireless, turning her over from year to year, driving the plows back and forth with steeds.

1. Antistrope-Even the lightly gliding flock of birds he snares and hunts the beast horde of the wilderness and the life that swims in the sea with woven nets, all-pondering man, and with cunning overpowers the beast that spends its nights on mountains and roams, the rough-maned neck of the steed and the unvanquished mountain bull he forces under the yoke.

2. Strophe-And into the sound of the word into wind-swift understanding he found his way and into the disposition of ruling over cities. And he considers how he might flee exposure to the arrows of weather and inhospitable frosts. Everywhere underway and yet with no way out, he comes to nothing. The onslaught of death alone he can never resist by flight, even if he can meetly avoid afflicting illness.

2. Antistrophe-Uncanny, ruling over expectation: the machinations of knowledgeif he falls into the worse, another time he comes to the more valorous. Between the ordinance of the earth and the sworn dispensation of the gods he fares. Rising high in the state and losing the state he goes, for whom he is nonbeing for the sake of daring. Let him not share my hearth nor be with me in counsel, who does such things.

121. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]

Thank you for your letter from July and for your translation of polla to deina ...

Both pleased me very much.

Heidelberg, May 14, 1936

Your Jaspers

122. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, May 16, 1936

Dear Jaspers!

It is magnificent how you set forth one work after another. In Rome, where I gave the enclosed lecture on Holderlin,l I heard that you are working on a book on Nietzsche. In February of this year, I announced for the coming winter a lecture course on Nietzsche's Will to Power; it should be my first. Now that your work is out,' I don't need to make this attempt, for my intention was precisely said simply and clearly in the Foreword: to show that the moment has come to move from reading Nietzsche to working on Nietzsche. Now in the first hour I can simply refer to your work, which additionally is manageable for the students-and, for the winter, I will choose another lecture course.3

In the last few days, I received the enclosed pamphlet with the newly found curriculum vitae4 of the young Nietzsche and wanted to send it to you anyway, as I thought it would still come in time for your work. In the fall I became-very reluctantly and only because of the subject matter-a member of the committee for the Nietzsche edition. I will, to the best of my ability, see to it that your desiderata do not just remain requests.

On the occasion of a meeting in Weimar in February of this year, I got to see the just discovered curriculum vitae; it made such an immediate impression that I suggested we publish it at once, in order to show today's youth an example of how a nineteen-year-old sees his life. The original is in chancellery format but, unfortunately, the pages are broken up in the new edition and, unfortunately, the pamphlet is too expensive; but, in spite of this, I pressed to keep it as affordable as possible.

I believe you will be pleased with it.

Rome and Italy-for the first time. We travelled all together at the same time: my wife, Jorg, and Hermann. Actually, I was confused for the entire ten days in Rome, almost angry and furious-I understood why only later; impressions do not at all affect me directly; things seem to simply sink into me, and then, one day, they arise for the first time in memory-and these seem to be stronger than in the present-I suddenly catch myself unawares, standing in front of Michelangelo's Moses in the semidarkness of San Pietro in Vincoli, or on the Piazza Novona, or in Tusculum; in general, the landscape.

In the meantime I am again into daily work, always only interpreting: this time only Schelling's treatise on freedom,5 just as I took great pains over Aristotle fifteen years ago. In the lessons, Kant's critique of aesthetic judgment-slowly I come closer to the point and marvel and marvel. The Swabians, among whom I must count myself, are known to become smart only after their fortieth year, and this also suffices to understand what is actually going on in philosophy. Then one's own floundering becomes very indifferent and serves only as an expedient, like a rope ladder, to climb into the abysses and up the steep faces. At times, one would like to have several heads and hands.

The Jaspers envelope on my desk is getting thicker and thicker.

In other respects, it is lonely.

We might actually count the fact that Philosophy has gone unnoticed as a wonderful situation, for now it is a matter of inconspicuously fighting for it; for example, through such a lecture course on a Schelling treatise, which by itself works remarkably well. Anyway, it becomes clear, now and then, what has happened and what we are lacking: namely, truly knowing that we are lacking something.

The new work is the best proof that things are going well with you. I wish you everything you need to take the next step.

In Sincere Friendship

Your

Martin Heidegger6

123. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]

Heidelberg, May 16, 1936

Dear Heidegger!

I just received your letter with the precious gifts. I am glad to hear from you, and I am especially pleased that you are at your task with such obvious energy. I am eager to read your Holderlin, which I want to take up yet this evening, but, at first impulse, I would like to thank you.

Your attitude toward philosophy in this age is probably also my own; your high estimations-Nietzsche, Holderlin-bring us close together. That I remain silent in spite of this, you will understand and approve of. My soul has grown silent, for in this world I don't remain without notice like Philosophy, as you write yourself, but I am ... but the word stops short-but in silent effect, as long as it is granted, we can find one another.'

I enjoyed reading about your impressions of Rome. What a magnificent experience, to see at this age Rome and the Mediterranean landscape for the first time! It is remarkable the way you depict your experience, not at the moment and yet assimilating; the role of memory is productive, as it were. I believe I am also familiar with this, but the main feature is different with me. I give myself over to the moment, become enthusiastic and insatiable; thus, in my defenselessness, I will make more mistakes and work less than you-but then, to be sure, memory becomes for me the source of philosophizing, the constantly enlivening ground and the measure, and philosophizing itself owes a great deal of thanks to it.

The Nietzsche manuscript, which I have gladly received again from your hand, was sent to me a few days ago from Weimar. I immediately showed it to the students in my seminar3 and commented on it. This early knowing, which already anticipates everything in question, and this nobility and entirely consuming seriousness, are moving. Yes, this is how the German student should be!

With sincere greetings

Your

KJ

124. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1*]

Heidelberg, October 12, 1942

Dear Heidegger!

I am embarrassed when I not only thank you for your Plato essayand for your HOlderlin interpretation3-but also when I want to answer them. I no longer know, really and clearly, to whom I should write, for we haven't spoken to one another for almost ten years. You wrote a friendly confirmation4 that you had received my Nietzsche in 1936 and, with it, a line about yourself personally; important, but without any hidden question and without-in the given situationallowing me to make any real comment on it. Then I didn't hear any more from you, neither in regard to my personal fate since 19375 nor in regard to two books I sent to you in 1937 and 1938, and I can only assume it is likely that they wound up in your hands. From you came only these two essays, both unmistakenly in your spirit, but both in a kind of language that I perhaps do not completely understand, because the background that has developed with you in the meantime is unknown to me.7

I only write all of this to explain why I am embarrassed .8

What you write about Plato's doctrine of truth speaks to me because, just as you so often did in your earlier philosophizing you try to penetrate to the origin. What you yourself answer to the question, in my opinion, arrives at a meaning that goes backward against the fact of your questioning and against the fundamental claim that you raise. If the sentiment from which I understand these texts is not affected by you, with Holderlin or Plato, I still admire your extraordinary gift for detecting something philosophical where no one else seems to preceive it. It is perhaps because of my weak ability that your substantial discourse seems to collaborate against your initial point of departure. Your first step seems to find the right level, but your further course seems not to grasp the possible substance, seems to forgo method, and to put in its place only order and presentation, form of

expression, and gestures of totality. I mean this in a positive sense, affirmative in itself, but to me it seems to be only a substitute for real method. Specifically, if I were to follow you, I would become confused in my frame of mind. An example right at the beginning: the "unsaid" of a thinker, for which I "squander" myself-true, I read it in complete agreement, deep memories become present to me-but then: "being able to know prospec- tively"10-it affects me like a sudden darkening of the space just opened up, for an unsaid that I can later know is precisely never that for which I squander myself, but that for which I perhaps employ all of my labor power, not myself. In what follows, the "turn in the attunement of the essence of truth "11 indeed remains for me an extraordinary problem, and certainly rightly sketched out by you, but in the shape that you give it here it is historically unbelievable. I note that I probably cannot judge what you really want to do here.

That will lie in the fact that I do not yet understand truth as unconcealment in the sense that you mean. What you suggest in the last six lines at the end" I would like to have seen developed. If the limited possibilities for publishing force you to cutback, that would be infinitely more important to me than the Plato interpretation, which would be understandable only as the result of such a foundation; thus, the whole thing strikes me as a constant tension without resolution, like a promise that is is disappointed at the end. I could almost say that, at the end of the reading, I feel deceived, for you always talked about unconcealment without saying what it actually is. At first, the point seems to be provisionally supported by the Greek meaning of the word, which I also read in Soden,13 but then, at the end, you refrain from conveying anything other than a promise for the future that strikes me as empty-thus, I must confess the shortcomings of my ability to comprehend, which do not prevent me from being able to perceive your achievement in its diligence and care, in its interpretive art, and the earnestness that underlies it.

With sincere greetings from the distant past.

125. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1*]

Professor Jaspers
Heidelberg/Plöck 66
[Stamp]

Heidelberg, March 1, 1948

Dear Heidegger!

My writing you today is occasioned by my momentary situation before my emigration to Basel,2 but it is founded through my long cherished wish to say at least a few words to you after such a long time. I could not take any initiative after it disappeared with you, and I simply didn't know to whom I would be speaking. I don't even know today, but I seem to have had enough of keeping silent.

When in 1945 the danger of National Socialist censorship was disposed of, I waited for a letter from you that would explain what was incomprehensible to me. Since, in 1933, you silently gave up every meeting with me, and finally every word,3 I hoped for an unreserved pronouncement from you, which was only now possible.

Instead, something else happened. At the end of 1945, a Freiburg University committee,4 in reference to your own request, asked me about you. Because a refusal on the basis of my own hesitancy seemed impossible to me, I answered.5 I empowered the recipient to inform you about all of the practically relevant points, if you so desired. In any case, I am enclosing a transcript of that letter. I still consider its contents to be correct today.

Many years ago, around 1934, when I had your confidential letter to Gottingen on behalf of Baumgarten entirely in front of me, I wanted to tell you what I thought. I didn't do that out of mistrust of one who, in the terror state, did not positively prove himself to be a true friend. I followed the "caute" of Spinoza' and the advice of Plato: to take cover in such times as in a rainstorm .8 What I wanted to say then I also did not say in the letter of 1945. In accordance with validities cleansed of personal dismay-I cannot

forget your words about the intellectual circle around Max Weber, and your use of the word Jew with the meaning it had between us at that time-I restricted myself in the letter to Freiburg to what was objectively relevant. In the coolness of these remarks, you cannot perceive what lies in my heart. My letter was composed with the intention of accepting the inevitable and, in the situation that was dangerousforyou,9 of helping to produce the best possible outcome so that you could carry on with your work.

The good memories that bind us together from a world long passed away are not extinguished for me. In the meantime, we have lived since 1933 without contact and in different worlds. A factical break has ensued, after which a wordless link to something past is not very well possible.

It is foreign and almost unbearable to me to become separated from a person with whom I was connected. I suffered in this way in my relation to you since 1933 until, still in the 1930s, as commonly happens in the course of time, this suffering almost disappeared under the weight of far more terrible things. Only distant memory remains and an occasional, always renewed, astonishment.

As before, I would not like to make the break final, as it was not expressly brought about by you, by pronouncing its facticity. On the contrary, I would like, as far as I am concerned, to preserve the possibility that serious words can once again be exchanged between us. I would also like, if possible, to help with my modest energies in case you are not allowed to publish. It is not only an inextinguishable interest for me, but, it is clear, it is also an indubitable, material, European interest that you make your work known through publication. Since 1945 I have used every occasion to assert this. 10, 11

In the winter of 1945, I sent you the pamphlet "The Transformation " [Die Wandlung] with two first remarks from me about the situ- ation.12 As before, I received no confirmation that you received it. I would still like to send you my publications, insofar as you do not forbid me to do so with this persistent silence; I accommodate myself to this.

I will not write about us and what we have experienced. That I and my wife are alive is still present everyday as a miracle. Myphys- ically ill condition has not changed. My energies are, as before, very modest.

I send you greetings with my best wishes

Your

/Karl, jaspersl

126. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]

Basel, February 6, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

I have wanted to write to you for a long time now. Today, on a Sunday morning, the impulse finally came to me. I will attempt it.

There was once between us something that bound us together. I cannot believe that it has been extinguished without remainder. The time seems to have become ripe for me to turn to you in hope that you would like to oblige me in the desire to occasionally exchange a few words.

The presuppositions in both of us have become other than they were before 1933. A minimum of sentences is absolutely necessary to find the connection with the core of what-already at the time with many wonderful accompanying phenomena-spoke to us.

In 1945 I expected an explanation from your side-I waited-it seemed to me that an initiative from my side would destroy everything that was possible at that time. In the fall of 1945 I sent you the first volume of The Transformation.' Perhaps, I thought, you could take my first public statments that stand there as an occasion to say something to me that was not possible to say before 1945.

In December of 1945 I wrote, at the request of the Freiburg Committee, which referred to a recommendation from your side, a letter about you.3 I authorized them to inform you immediately about the letter in respect to its practically decisive passages, about the rest later. I never learned whether you read it or not, but I may assume you did. From it you know what forced me to wait to see if you would find a word for me: not only your silent break since 1933 but, above all, your writing about Baumgarten, a transcript of which I saw in 1934.4 This moment belongs to the most decisive experiences of my life. Personal dismay was inseparable from the objective

weight of the event. This is not to mention that, in August 1933, I read a letter in your own handwriting. The young man to whom the letter was addressed brought it to me, perplexed, in Oldenburg, to substantiate the radicality of the decision-the opposite of the decision you demanded in the letter that was written in a way of speaking that, until then, I had not seen in you.5

Now a lot of time has passed. I may take as a presupposition from now on that you do not see it necessary to explain to me these things that pertain to us personally ("the Jew Fraenkel," "the intellectual circle around Max Weber," among others).' I accept it.

I don't know what you will reproach me for, perhaps with justification. For myself, I may say that I don't blame you because your conduct in this world-upheaval does not lie primarily at the level of moralizing debates. The infinite sadness since 1933, and the present situation, in which my German soul only suffers more and more, have not bound us together but silently separated us. In the long years of banishment and danger to my life, the monstrousness, which is something completely different from mere politics, allowed no corresponding word to be spoken between us. We have slipped further away as human beings. My wife7 is present to me at every moment, about whom I said in our next-to-last meetings that she is decisive for all of my philosophizing (I still see the look of amazement on your face).

I do not conceal any of this to myself. I accept it as a fact, which may be accessible to interpretation, but its illumination, for which I waited for years, may not remain a condition for our speaking to one another. The darkness will remain a presupposition that does not prevent us from exchanging a few words in philosophizing and, perhaps, also in private things, even if nothing extraordinary should happen between us.

This can also not be hindered by the fact that we strive for something very different in philosophy and have a philosophical self-consciousness of a character that is alien to one another. The fact that, in the world, people so often place our names together is inappropriate to you as it is to me: thus,

independently of one another, we expressed this in 1936-37 in letters to jean Wahl, which he published,10 in different tones but agreeing in meaning." This is also no reason for keeping silent with one another-for in everything that is not simply transparent, including a difference that goes to the depth of a fundamental comportment, what is always philosophy must, neverthless, be bound together in origin and end. That is a faith, like the faith in communication-a faith against deceptive appearances. If my memory does not deceive me, we were once united in this.

I greet you from a distant past, from beyond an abyss of the times, holding steadfast to something that was and that cannot be nothing.

Your

[Karl Jaspers]

127. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., June 22, 1949

Dear Jaspers!

Yesterday, Heig' told me that you wrote to me in February. To my great regret, this letter did not arrive. I would certainly have answered you immediately. It is clearly not the first time in the last few years that important foreign mail did not reach me.

I thank you sincerely for this letter; that you wrote is a great joy to me. Throughout all errancy and confusion, and an occasional souring, my relationship to you, which was established in the 1920s at the beginning of our paths, has remained untouched for me. Since we were moved spatially closer together, the distance was all the more painful for me.

The guardians of thinking are still only a few in the rising exigency of the world; all the same, they must hold out against dogmatism of every kind, without expecting any real result. The world public and its organization is not the site where the fate of the human essence is decided.

One should not speak of solitude, but it remains the only place where those who think and poetize according to their human abilities stand by being.

From this place, I greet you sincerely.

Your

Heidegger

128. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, June 25, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

I just received your letter from June 22. I thank you sincerely. My letter to you from February was written by hand, but I asked my wife to type it for me. Now I am enclosing the typescript. When the devil or technology wants to trip us up, we must, for our part, exercise patience and caution. Hopefully, this letter will get through. To increase the chances, I am sending it this time by registered mail.

To my great joy you tell me that our relationship, where it was essential, remains untouched. May something still come of this!

Today, only these accompanying words to the old letter-and, in addition, the communication that reached me yesterday: Erich Frank suddenly died in Amsterdam,' a few days after his first landing in Europe, on his way through Marburg to see us. My wife and I are very sad not to be able to speak with our true friend again. You once worked decisively for his appointment to Marburg.2 The news will certainly move you.

With sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

129. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, July 5, 1949

Dear Jaspers!

I thank you sincerely for both of your letters. My wife and I have in the meantime moved again to the cabin, but later than in previous years because of the weather, as the cabin is no longer so weatherproof and is more difficult to live in than when we were younger. I get the mail to Freiburg brought up here only in intervals and occasionally. For that reason, my answer has been delayed.

Over the years, I have remained certain that the relationship between the critical points of our thinking existence are unshakable, but I found no way toward dialogue. This became even more difficult for me since the spring of 1934, when I went into opposition and also internally severed myself from all matters at the university, for my helplessness increased.

Whoever has not experienced the fate that was dealt to you and your wife can never know it. That our eldest son is now in the fifth year of Russian captivity and is even more endangered because of his name and descent-the younger one was released from there in 1947 due to illness-gives the preconditions for bringing this knowledge belatedly into one's own.

If I do not go into explanations pertaining to your first letter, it is not because I want to pass over anything. Mere explaining will immediately go awry by becoming interminable.

Coming to terms with the German disaster and its entanglement in world history and modernity will take the rest of our lives! It is the same as being conscious of what is uncanny: that however more essentially we take what is essential, its accomplishment must alienate itself in something factical, and this lays waste almost relentlessly to everything essential today.

Perhaps being [Seyn] must, to speak crudely, first wrest itself out of this Platonism if a path to redemption is to remain safeguarded for human kind.

In this, presumably some kind of condition, although nonapparent, is alloted to our paths of thinking. It is not to be found in what today's opinion imagines to itself with the thoughtless coupling of our names. Whether some kernel of our efforts belongs to what will survive the next three centuries of devastation, we don't need to know.

It might be enough if each of us still continues for a stretch along our path.

You are in the middle of publishing a far-reaching work. You retain a source of freshness through a radiant, academic effectiveness.

With me, everything is going-I say this calmly and without complaint-backward, as if only what is my own should be thought even more distinctly at this point on the path, a point which I was forced into when I was forced out of theology-and that means out of metaphysics-in 1911.

I have the feeling of only growing in the roots and no longer in the branches, so you will find me ready for the auspicious moment of the dialogue but, at the same time, slower and less informed.

The last thing I read by Erich Frank, whose quiet and conscientious character I always valued, was a review of your Philosophy,' which appeared, to the best of my knowledge, in Logos. It was by far the best and most instructive of what was said at that time. A person of his kind can probably die from the shock of such a return.

The flood of suffering continually rises, but man becomes shallower, nevertheless.

We will probably stay up here until the onset of winter. I would like to acquire more of the wisdom that lies concealed in stabilitas loci.

I greet you sincerely.

Your

Martin Heidegger

130. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]

Basel, July 10, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

Your suffering is hard to bear: waiting for your Jorg-I didn't know that he is in Russia-the homecoming of your ill Hermann-the whole catastrophe of this politics has also struck you. There is still hope; may it be fulfilled! My wife, who, for her part, remembered better than I, described your two sons-whom we never saw again after 1921-to me from the echo of your earlier accounts, and said imediately: then Jorg is in Russia.

From your letter, something spoke to me that I have hardly otherwise heard since our separation, something that touches me in its inconceivability, as it once was, with an only slightly modified tone and with a now-conscious perspective into what is most expansive.

What you call wresting free from Platonism is meaningful to me only if you mean by it the doctrine of ideas and its later transformation into conceptual realism and its antithesis. Plato himself, for whom something like a doctrine of ideas was, for a time, a means in his thrilling performances, which he then gave up and transformed into what is, for us, an opaque theory of numbers, a new performance-this Plato seems to me unmatched in what is essential to us; i.e., in the seriousness that it all served. If the second half of his Parmenides would be performed anew with today's methods (and not Neoplatonically), then all bad metaphysics would be overcome, and the space would be open for a pure hearing of the language of being. What you call the revelation of being is, for me, inaccessible so far. The site from which you greet me-perhaps I have never entered it, but I gladly receive such a greeting with admiration and excitement.

What you write about yourself-growing in the roots-that must certainly be good and essential. The decision of 1911 is alive in the present for me,

from your accounts. This differentiates you through the most earnest resolution in the ground of philosophizing.

You probably have a rosy picture of me. I know being a wanderer and a guest as my German destiny, it was clear since 1934, when my eighty-four-year-old father said to me: "My boy, we have lost our fatherland!" A sadness lies like a veil over everything. I will never come out of it, despite the cheerfulness of the facade. To live and teach in Basel seems, under the circumstances, to be the most pleasant thing possible for my wife and me-for being allowed a stay of execution on an island whose existence is a miraculous anachronism; the better Germany, in tone of life and sense of freedom very analogous to the peasant class from which I am descended.' Here there is sanctuary for old people. If I were young, I would, without doubt, rush to America in order to reach the spiritual level and true, fundamental experiences of the age. When I received the call to Basel, which I did not incite and did not wish for, the decision was not easy, nevertheless. I didn't want to hurt anyone, but the attachment to a land and a people no longer existed-in spite of the best and most dependable friends, individuals. A new attachment, in face of my hopes of 1945-it was clear to me-did not grow. My public existence was that of a puppet who had little to do with me.3 The fundamental consciousness of standing before the gates, but not stepping through them, does not leave me, nor does the feeling as if something decisive will still become clear to me or could be brought to me by others-but also the wistfulness of Kant, which you know: to have to leave just when one could begin to philosophize correctly.

I am sending you several of my addresses. If you wish to have a look at my writings, I will gladly forward to you what appeared after 1945, insofar as I can still arrange it. Without your requesting it I wouldn't want to burden you with so much paper. Of your writings, I have, as far as I know, everything except your new edition of What is Metaphysics?4

I thank you sincerely for your letter and greet you with my best wishes for your sons.

Your Karl Jaspers

131. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Presently St. Moritz, August 6, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

An American friend told me that he had read in the New York Times that you had received and accepted an appointment to Buenos Aires. However it is, I sincerely congratulate you on the appointment offer-there will certainly be a grain of truth in this. To be wanted is always pleasant to people like us.

I thank you for your three writings' that you sent to me-probably on occasion of my last letter. They came to me very welcome here in the vacation.' I have read the letter on humanism just now, although I bought it for myself already last year in the Swiss edition.3

I was enthralled. Your defense against misunderstanding is impressive. Your interpretations of the ancients are always sur prising. Whether right or wrong, that is of no consequence in respect to where you are speaking from and where you want to lead. I am interested without becoming clear. Many questions arise. I have not yet succeeded in reaching the middle of the whole thing. I help myself a little with memories of things from Asia, where I liked to go over the years, knowing full well that I do not actually penetrate into it, but from there I am awakened in a wonderful way. Your being, the clearing of being, your reversal of our relation to being into the relation of being to us, the leaving-over of being itself-I believe I have perceived something of this in Asia. That you push in that direction-and, as your interpretation of Being and Time asserts, you have always pushed in that direction-is extraordinary. I am unable to reach it, even though there is nothing I would rather do, and I always, so to speak, mean to be at, or before, this place. What you have produced up to now is for my comprehension still essentially a promise. You talk about preparation, indeed about gathering-but even that is a lot. I have, obviously, not at all understood your book Being and Time in your sense.

Opposition would only be meaningful in a direct verbal exchange. You are aware of the doubtfulness of discussion, but you want to make this possible with your pronouncements. You yourself discuss, even fiercely, even argumentatively, but the question as to how we are to emerge out of the monologue-and the repetition of the monologue by others-is indeed a vital question for our current philosophizing.

I still continue to stumble with your sentences. The meaning material in which you philosophize is, grasped in the immediacy of the sentences, often unacceptable to me. I cannot understand many of your central words. Language as "the house of being"5-I bristle, because all language seems to be only a bridge to me. Language itself is, in communication, to be brought to nullification in reality through action, actuality, love. I could almost say conversely: "Where there is language, there being itself is not yet or no longer," but with this I am not saying anything to you that would hit upon the sense in which you write about this. I am anxious to see what will still come of this and how you fulfill your promise.

With sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

The pen that I have here makes the writing even less intelligible. Please excuse this!

132. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, August 12, 1949

Dear Jaspers!

For more than fourteen days, half of a letter to you-as an answer to yours and as thanks for your two Goethe lectures and the inaugural address,' has been left lying. In the meantime, I was prevented from completing it by revisions, empty visits which set in with the end of the semester and the beginning of vacation, and by the fact that my wife had to go back to Freiburg to make sure everything in the house, which is competely occupied, is in order.

I was especially pleased that you sent me your Frankfurt Goethe lecture, which I still didn't know.

As a result of a lesson from the last and previous years, I noticed that in its tone and low level the intention of the vilification by E. R. Curtius2 is, in actuality, worthless. I would not have expected that a man who now wants to be celebrated as the foremost philologist in the world would read so badly. Your lecture says the opposite of what C. imputes to you. To me, the whole thing is incomprehensible and repulsive, but public opinion feeds itself only on such empty sensations. This piece of scribbling is harmless in its wretchedness; it is otherwise with the attack directed at me by Lukacs3 in a Berlin journal, which has the very real intention of immediately seeing to my liquidation.

An attack could certainly be directed against your comprehension of Goethe, but I don't know how this could happen without falling back into the bygone time of our gandfathers. C. doesn't at all know where we are, he doesn't want to know it. This blindness, that has today been elevated at the universities into a principle, is the worst, especially when a pseudo-Christian facade is still placed around it. The central position, the angle of your lecture, I see in pages 19-21, where you deal with modern technology.

To be sure, what is asserted today about technology, as much as I know it, never reaches the dimension of what now and in the future is going on with us under this name.

It seems to me that we are lacking the preconditions for experiencing this; moreover, the flight to Goethe prevents us from even inquiring about these preconditions. I myself admittedly still have no sufficient relation to Goethe. That is a real deficiency, but only one among many. I think that you have long forgotten C.'s vilification. Still worse than this is the complete depravity of the press.

So I have neither accepted nor been offered an appointment in Argentina. This report that originated in America was already in the German papers in May. I wrote at that time-as an exception-a short correction to the Hamburg Welt, but it was so skillfully mounted that it remained completely unnoticed.

Your congratulations, however, are independent of all of that. I thank you for it.

I would much rather go into your previous and last letter, but where to begin? What you say about monologue is right. But much would already be gained if monologues may remain what they are. It almost seems to me that they aren't this yet at all; they are not yet strong enough for this.

With the arrival of your letter, a saying of Nietzsche occurred to me that you are naturally familiar with: "A hundred deep solitudes together form the city of Venice-this is its magic. A picture for the human beings of the future."

What is thought here lies beyond the alternative of communication and noncommunication.

In addition to this, take Lessing's words about the windmills.4

In face of what is thought here and there, and what is essentially thought in the future, we are true dwarfs.

You know that I am a frugal reader and even slower than frugal; from this comes much ignorance and one-sidedness.

What you say about the Asiatic is exciting; a Chinese5 who came to my lectures on Heraclitus and Parmenides6 in 1943-44 (I gave at that time only one-hour interpretations of a few fragments) likewise found resonances with Eastern thinking. I remain skeptical where I am not at home in the language; I was even more skeptical when the Chinese, who is himself a Christian theologian and philosopher, translated with me a few words of Lao Tze. Through questioning, I first experienced how foreign the entire way of speaking is to us; we then gave up the attempt. Nevertheless, something exciting lies here and, as I believe, something essential for the future, when, after centuries, the devastation has been overcome. The resonances presumably have an entirely different root. Since 1910, the master of reading and living, Eckehardt, has accompanied me. This, and the always new attempt to think through Parmenides' to gar auto estin to kai einai, the constant question about the auto, which is neither noein nor einai, the lack of the subject-object relation in the Greeks, brought me to what, in proximity to my own thinking looks like a reversal but is still something else and prior to it.

The letter on humanism,7 which I was forced to publish because, due to indiscretions, it already circulated around Paris for half a year before in uncontrollable transcripts and translations, will certainly produce new misunderstandings and catchphrases.

I wish you a wonderful time in the mountains and between the lakes.

With sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

As soon as I have more time, I will write about the inaugural address.

133. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, August 17, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you for your letter. What you say about the Curtius pamphlet in the press coincides with my view. I was pleased to see it confirmed by you. At the beginning, the matter was a painful disappointment: this gleam of hatred from a man I have known for forty years simply hurt me-because of its inhumanity. The rest was, as you say, a sensation without any content-but painful once again as a symptom of the German condition.

Your appointment to Argentina as a press sensation is very annoying!-and with this the New York Times is supposed to be uncommonly reliable in its reporting! By the way, I am happy that you aren't going there. Aside from the stablitas loci, about which you recently wrote' (which seems wonderful to me; all the more so since I have never had it), I would not have wanted to see you in the midst of the large Nazi community there. The attack by Lukacs naturally has its reasons. Even there we are thrown together in one pot.2 Colonel Tulpanov3 attacked me personally, my Idea of the Uni- versity4 is forbidden in the Eastern zone. When I publicly praised an author from the Eastern zone5 he complained that it was incriminating for him. In Geneva in 1945, I had a public discussion with Lukacs.6 Afterward, he said: "Heidegger is at least a clear appearance of the decline of the bourgeoisie; I am nothing without a sociological locus." I knew him before 1914.7 The transformation that has taken place in him was horrible to see. From a gifted, scintillating man, he became an empty piece of machinery. His dullness was astonishing. Because I wanted to be friendly to a representative of the East, I put up with it.

What you say about monologues (we are "perhaps no yet strong enough" for them) and about the solitude ("beyond the altervative communication-non-noncommunication") I believe I understand, with a look to works like those of Lao Tze or Spinoza. Spinoza had arranged to publish his Ethics

after his death without his name: It would make no difference who speaks the truth. That has great style. Such works can promote communication as a result, but they don't talk about it. For us, everything seems to depend upon the truth that binds us together and has its factical appearance in the deepening of communication.

I agree with you that the authentic, the essential, always lies beyond communication and noncommunication, subject and object, being and thinking, etc.-and lies in the fact that all of our thinking becomes groundless and scattered when it loses this relation. But we can only talk-and communicate-within the oppositions, in the appearances of the infinite. Only through the latter can we approach the former. Not only Schelling's indifference and all other phrases of the idealists, but also mysticism in its obsession with images, which always say the same thing, seem to me to be a great temptation to run away from the world and from men and from friends-and to get nothing in return, when it succeeds, but an endless light, an unfillable abyss. I admit that I follow this path all too readily at the hand of the ancients, but a shock must always free us from this enchantment.

This liberation, however, happens fundamentally by becoming conscious of thought techniques you reject this, in that by technology you understand something under this word that is too narrow, a mere means for understanding. I mean: We must become master of our thoughts and our thinking-then we will know in each case what we have done by thinking, liberate ourselves from images and dogmatisms, and become prepared for reality.

Even those mystical-speculative thoughts-perhaps the most magnificent and hidden thought that philosophy has producedmust be illuminated in this sense by thought technique or method. They must lose their naivete so that they do not hold us spellbound and allow us to miss what is really necessary for the age.

When, in the Parmenides fragments, you make to auto the subject of the sentence through an act of grammatical violence," I gladly share in the meaning that may open up to you in what follows later. I am moved and

would like to hear more-but I doubt, then, whether any headway can be made there, except when experience shifts into appearances of this world, in praxis, in knowledge-that means when measures and directions which show themselves indirectly impress themselves upon us.

What you say about us as dwarfs agrees with my own sentiments. I sometimes use the same word, which, as far as I know, was first used by Burckhardt,9 but I also know what kind of pride lies hidden there: specifically, to have entered the realm of the great, to have risked in some corner one's quiet, modest words and then to realize that one does not belong to them, but was nevertheless with them in another way than most of one's contemporaries; therefore, we know how small we are, but also what a claim-to have dealings with them, so to speak!

I am sending you another address (in Geneva in 1946)10 and my last book"-not with the demand that you read everything, obviously, but with the hope that you could sometime take a look here or there (e.g., in the last book, the sections on technology12 and science13).

Should I send you my publications since 1945? Even less to read them, the question is only if you want to put the volumes on the shelf or if your space is taken by better works.

The Nietzsche landscape14 that we enjoyed for four weeks was stimulating. I wondered whether, from this place, from where you write to me, the means are found to show something that is evident to me: why Rilke is not like Holderlin and Nietzsche but is an unconscious mimicry of them in an artistically respectable living and dying, but without origin and authenticity, and only understandable through both of them and a few others?-and how it is possible that Brecht15 and Bollnow'6 accomplish a strange self-revelation by calling Rilke a "philosopher of Existent" and giving lectures about him that are convincing and thrilling for almost everyone-and just as well intended and respectable as Rilke himself. No, this is saying too much; Rilke is naturally not to be put together with these two.

Enough now.

With sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

134. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Todtnauberg, September 21, 1949

Dear Jaspers!

I don't want to let my thanks for your book, which is beautiful inside and outside, and for the lecture' be overdue any longer. You made me very happy, especially with your dedication.2 I hope that I can respond with a thank-you gift in October.

The waves of public opinion pound up to here. Because I am a slow reader, I am unsuccessful, at first, in coming up with an appropriate response. Writing is difficult for me in general. I hope that in the foreseeable future you will come to Germany once again. Then a dialogue could set many things directly into motion and, especially, what is essential.

That you think the simultaneity and synchronicity of Chinese, Indian, and Western centuries as axial time3 seems essential to me, for here a world axis conceals itself, which could become a pivot upon which modern world-technology turns.

I also agree with you, as you will soon see more clearly, that modern technology is something essentially other than all previous technology.

But this other has its essential origin in the Greek inception of the West, and only here. I know too little to decide whether this technology could ever have originated from the other two spaces of axial time, but where is the measure for interpreting these three simultaneous spaces of time?

I cannot hold back the reservation that your interpretation of these spaces, even especially the Greek, perhaps moves within a too-traditional sphere of representation, wherein it indicates more similarity between them than, perhaps, they have. You reject the thought that modern technology has the character of an assault [Angriffl, but it does have this character and,

therefore, modern natural science and modern history also have it. It seems to me that the relationship between modern natural science and modern tech nology is not sufficiently clear with you, but, in essence, both are grounded in the essence of technology, which I allude to in the Letter on Humanism.4 This essence is, as far as I can see, the completed essence of Western metaphysics. The unfolding of the essence of technology begins, in a concealed way, with the idea of Plato. The assault upon beings already consists in the fact that the relation to beings gets the character of a grasping [Griff], which unfolds in modern times as objectification. Beings are ordered; that means brought to give an account before the court of calculation. In this, the judges could, prephilosophically and unphilosophically, have the opinion that they are humbly bowing before nature. But their ontically minded devotion is ontologically, at bottom, an assault [AngrifJ1.

Here, without presentiment, and that means in forgetting being, devotion stands at the sevice of assault; and this is not only produced by human beings. It is prepared by being in the shape of willing.

That is an indication of how I am attempting to get through here. When it is quieter, I will write again.

Our son was already in a releasement camp and, according to the report of a returned prisoner, was taken out again.

With sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

135. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, September 25, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

My best wishes on your sixtieth birthday!' May your son soon return home, may your personal relations take on a more pleasant shape than they have now, and may your philosophical path succeed in taking you to heights that are forgotten today!

The sixtieth year is without doubt the beginning of old age. The exuberance of one's youth and prime is no longer possible and, besides, it is unfitting today-but philosophizing does not follow the biological line; it can first rightly develop in old age. Perhaps what remains essential shows itself only to old age. Against bodily decline, a curve rises up into the eternal-not by itself and, most of the time, seemingly not at all; it depends upon the individual. I wish for you that you arrive there successfully.

The old Plato, the old Michelangelo, Rembrandt, the old Goethethey touched upon the deepest in a wondrous way. They encourage us smaller people. It is a secret that man must not become old spiritually.

Your profound letter just arrived. Sincere thanks. Perhaps sometime I will write to you about the assault character. It seems to me that there are still things to be clarified here before one decides. I will learn more from your book, which I anxiously await.

Kate Victorius2 spoke about you. A good soul, deeply perceptive psychologically, sociable, and courageous.

Sincere greetings Your Karl Jaspers

136. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Mef9kirch, November 23, 1949

Dear Jaspers!

My thanks for your letter for my birthday is coming late.' It was a great pleasure. My thoughts often go to you but go into the pen with difficulty. The immediacy of dialogue not only saves many detours but also awakens what is unexpected. I just received the little pamphlets in the last few days. The text2 was written this spring for a commemorative book on my homeland.

The Holzwege3 are also there. Tomorrow, I am going back to Freiburg. You will receive a copy as soon as possible.

I have worked here with my brother after staying in Todtnauberg became impossible at the beginning of the month because of the weather.

I do not like to talk about my situation. To be sure, Rector Tel- lenbach4 took the initiative to obtain a clarification.

The university has resubmitted my application for emeritus status, which I furnished in October of 1945. The French military government has told me that they and the ministry in Paris are in agreement with this. On September 28 of this year I received, apparently as a birthday gift, notification from the Baden Finance Ministry that my earnings have been set at 160 Marks per month.

Jorg is still in Russia. The date for his return home has supposedly been postponed until May 1950.

I am not writing all of this to complain. I have even asked my acquaintances in Freiburg to not undertake anything. At bottom, they (especially the Catholic political authorities) are afraid that, as an emeritus,

I could perhaps lecture once again, or even that I burn with the expectation of this. But lecturing is over once and for all.

I actually wanted to write to you about your understanding of technology, but I am not collected enough. I hope it will come in the course of the next few weeks.

I greet you sincerely

Your

Martin Heidegger

137. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, November 25, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

Sincere thanks! I read the Feldwegl with emotion. Memory and eternity, beautiful and true.

The communication from the Finance Ministry frightened me. The matter cannot rest there.

I don't yet know whether I will come to Freiburg sometime next summer. At present, I still have no papers with which, as a German, I can travel across the border, but I would like to, and then I would gladly speak with you.

Today only this hasty greeting. I am convalescing from shingles and must use all of my energy to do justice to my teaching activities.

Sincerely

Your K. Jaspers

138. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, December 2, 1949

Dear Heidegger!

I now come to you unfortunately with an annoying, if also fundamentally trivial, matter that of a critical review in the Zeit of December 1.1 My respect for any possible reader is too great for me to want to undertake a correcton.

The passage cited by the reviewer is found on page 295 of the Swiss edition.2

I would like to show you my correction-it is enclosed3-and hear your opinion, and preferably your agreement, before I send it off. What I think, you will see from my writing. The reviewer seems to see "fury" in me.4 That would be an abominable residue of my frame of mind when I heard Krieck giving a talk in Heidelberg: Philosophy has come to an end (anthropology is beginning), all thinking from Plato to Nietzsche has been overcome (a propos of my Nietzsche book), now a new world-epoch is beginning and a new humanity, it is a matter of millenia, Hitler is saving humanity from the Nothing, everthing is at risk-and then the whole series of .heroic ways of speaking.

I would be grateful to you for the soonest possible advice with which I can send it off. Such corrections must follow immediately,5 otherwise they will have no effect.

I am in haste.

Sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

SHORT REPORT FROM HERMANN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, December 5, 1949

Most venerable Herr Professor!

My father has now departed. I only today received his address, to which I will forward your letter. Because I assume that you would like to reply as soon as possible to the article in the Zeit, I wanted to let you know about these facts.

139. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Hiifingen, bei Donaueschingen,

December 10, 1949

Dear Jaspers!

As Hermann already wrote, I am on the way and now on the journey to Mel kirch. Your letter with the scriptum just reached me here.

During my reading of the entire book,' I never had the impression that you turn against me and even with fury.

I find your correction to be good and short; in this case, it would be good to publish it. I felt gratified that during the last four years, where I was and am exposed to the most abusive reproaches, an attitude was adopted from the vicinity of your journal, The Transformation, that corresponded to your opinions. For this reason, I take it to be impossible from the outset that such a passage could be found in your latest book.

Of course, it is usual today to reckon with the opposition of names instead of thinking from the subject matter. They lie in wait for such things and then find them. It must be so in other cases as well. Ortega y Gassetz told me in a letter a few weeks ago that everywhere, when he speaks against existentialism, he never means Heidegger. That is indeed a little naive, but I take note of it.

That I have reservations about your last book, especially about what concerns technology, I have already written, but these are such essential questions that they can be discussed neither incidentally nor in the press.

You certainly remember our old plan, which I often consider, for us to publicly come to terms with one another at some time. Today, more than

ever, it would become a sensation and only a few would keep to the point-but perhaps it depends upon these few.

I was in Bremen with my wife; there, nineteen years ago, I gave my lecture "On the Essence of Truth" for the first time.3 I still have many old friends there and some newly acquired ones; I spoke to a private circle, since I no longer appear publicly.4 There is a beautiful, serious, and clear atmosphere there, open to the world in contrast to the stuffy and treacherous goings-on in South Baden. I also met your student Dr. Sawatzki5 there, whom I liked very much. On the second day of our stay in Bremen, the news reached us that Jorg is on his way home. Now, at least, this burden has been lifted.

In the next few days, I will have Holzwege sent to you by the publisher-for security reasons.

Sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

I am not familiar with the review in the Zeit; I read a newspaper only rarely.

140. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, January 14, 1950

Dear Heidegger!

Many thanks for your letter of 12.10. Upon receiving it, I immediately sent off the correction. In the meantime, it has long since appeared.'

You celebrated Christmas with both of your sons. I see it between your lines: after so many years of the greatest worry, a wonderful happiness. May both of them now find their way in Germany and a good way!

The other concern2 that you wrote about will be redressed. One must have patience, however unworthy the situation may be for you at present.

You remember our earlier plan-oh, how long ago, in another world-for a public coming to terms between us.3 It could mean something for the point at issue, as you say, if we could find an appropriate form of discussion for philosophizing as it takes place today with you and me. A polemic in the style of professors would make no sense-it is not, indeed, a matter of agreeably and irritably discussable problems-still less is it a sensation, which you anticipate, and which would certainly have to be endured as unavoidable. Only if we succeeded in reaching into one another through an unrestrained attempt at illumination and penetrated into the foundations of both sides and into the possibilities of our impulses (i.e., if we succeed in communicating in the matter, and if what is personally bound up with it becomes visible), only then would a step be taken that would truly be worth it. Now, would this be the right way: a philosophical correspondence that we would attempt next to our private correspondence, with the intention of speaking to one another until we reach the last attainable grounds, and then to publish this without any additional revisions? The Leibniz-Clarke4 correspondence is certainly nowhere a model for us, except, as it seems to me, in the manyfaceted to and fro. In this way, what solitary critical reviews never accomplish will become clear more directly and more quickly.

Discourse and response will stand, and that would have to be productive. This presupposes mutual trust and sincerity. Both of us must examine ourselves in case we would want to begin this. If we could allow the usual quarreling to disappear and risk the last extreme, then it would be worth it. A document would be produced that could be encouraging and helpful today, especially if it were clear at the end that there were a common point of reference-which we don't know-something exceptional would be attained. It would answer the question as to whether philosophical human beings could essentially talk to one another when an inexpressible unanimity in ethos does not indubitably exist. We would have to show it. Perhaps we can consider the plan. With me, at the moment, the burden of working with modest energies is a hindrance that I cannot yet overcome, but it is hopefully only a question of when I will unburden myself enough to have sufficient freedom for such a correspondence.

Thank you for Holzwege.5 I read about Nietzsche, 6 the age of the world-picture,7 and Rilke.8 I believe I at least see a little clearer what I could ask of you. Surprising coincidences9 in details and in the perplexity of what is, for me, a palpable distance in the whole excited me in the reading. If I became nettled, I would say to myself there are two things not to forget: Here it is always a matter of Holzwege,10 and of preparing the preliminaries. In this book, you show yourself in your old rank. It captivated me more than your writings to date,11 but what your actual intention is, I couldn't say. To begin a critique would not be possible today in a short letter. I remain in questioning suspense: whether it would be a fantastic and deceptive possibility of thinking-poetizing, or whether here begins a careful opening of the gate-whether a seductive breaking away from a present fulfillment of the ethos is taking place or, on the contrary, the making of a path that will lead to precisely such fulfillment at the end-whether gnostic godlessness finds words here or the extension of preception toward divinity.

You announce "further writings in preparation"-my best wishes for these!

Your Karl Jaspers

141. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., March 7, 1950

Dear Jaspers!

My answer to your last letter, which I have in mind every day in thankful joy, has been delayed even today for an excessively long time.

The misfortune of our son who has returned home, the clarification of my external situation,' and an unhoped-for magnanimity and joy2 came together.

Today, I would like to explain with only one sentence, which nullifies all other supposition and discussion, what I attempted to call helplessness in my first letter3 which came to you again.

Dear Jaspers!

Since 1933, I no longer came to your house, not because a Jewish woman lived there, but because I simply felt ashamed. Since then, I have not only not entered your house, but I have also never again entered the city of Heidelberg, which is what it is to me only because of your friendship.

When, at the end of the 1930s the worst evil set in with vile persecutions, I thought immediately about your wife. At that time, I received firm assurance through Prof. Wilser,4 whom I knew from here, and who at the time had close relations with the district leader there, that nothing would happen to your wife; but the anxiety remained, and the powerlessness and the failure-I do not relate this in order to give credit to myself with the mere appearance of giving help.

Even today, I would not like to enter Heidelberg before being received by you again in the kindly manner that always remains painful for me.

I greet you sincerely

Your

Martin Heidegger

142. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, March 19, 1950

Dear Heidegger!

I thank you sincerely for your frank explanation. My wife also says to send you her thanks. That you state that you felt ashamed means a lot to me. With that, you enter into the community of all of us who have lived and live in a condition for which shame is also an appropriate word.

I would like to say to you, from my wife and me, that we never assumed that my wife, being Jewish, was a reason for allowing our relations to die out. When I thought about it in years past, I only regretted the absence of motives with you that, in such radically transformed times, would have led you to me, would have led you to us. But we mutually do not want to examine ourselves. My first letter told you the same thing. An illumination would hardly be possible without seeing the connections of the German events in their totality.

You will excuse me when I say what I sometimes thought: that you seemed to behave toward the manifestations of National Socialism like a boy who dreams, who doesn't know what he is doing, who doesn't know how blindly and forgetfully he gets mixed up in an undertaking that looks to him like something completely different than what it is in reality, and then stands before a pile of rubble and allows himself to be driven further.

I thank you for your concern in 1939, with your inquiry through Wilser. You were thinking of us. The situation was as you said. Although the district leader in Heidelberg was particularly well-disposed toward me (in the confusion peculiar to National Socialists), and although I got from him and from other prominent people the firmest assurances, even in a document from the SD1 in Berlin sent to the Rector in Heidelberg,' I had long since understood that all of this could do nothing, that no National Socialist deserved to be trusted, because all of them stood mutually under

their own terror, which resulted in crimes and treacheries. Indeed, consistent with this, it ended when Goring was condemned to death by Hitler.

I hope with you that there will be an occasion to see one another and to speak to one another again. Then we will want to exchange one thing or another that withholds itself from letter writing. Until then, our writings stand at each other's disposal.

I am with you in my good wishes and greet you sincerely. We write to one another all too rarely!

Your Karl Jaspers

143. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, March 25, 1950

Dear Heidegger!

In the year 1946, three writings of mine appeared, all three in the same number of impressions (The Idea of the University, Nietzsche and Christianity, The Question of German Guilt).' Both of the first two were sold out years ago. The Question of German Guilt is not yet sold out today.2 What was published in this piece was part of a lecture course from the winter of 1945-46.3 The students filled the auditorium-it was a sensation-but they were as uninterested in these discussions as my countrymen have been at any other time. At that time, I placed a lot on my attempt, which was already paralyzed after a year.

Now I often think of your word shame. I think that perhaps my old writing could interest you; indeed, it could be understandable to you in its own impulse-therefore, I am sending it to you.

In those days I got many letters about this piece. Some scolded a little ("traitor," etc.), and many agreed, supplemented, modified; remarkably often came a sentence, ". . . but here, in this place, I am probably the only one who thinks this way." Now it is all as if forgotten long ago.

With sincere greetings

Your K. Jaspers

144. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., April 8, 1950

Dear Jaspers!

Thank you sincerely for both of your letters and for the piece of writing.' My reply would be an Easter greeting to you and your dear wife, and would say at the same time that the word shame was, and is, often spoken by my wife as well.

You are completely accurate with your image of the dreaming boy. In the winter of 1932-33 I had a sabbatical leave that was promised in 1930, when I was offered the appointment in Berlin. When I came back from the cabin, I was literally pushed from all sides into the rectorship. Even on the day of the selection, I went to the university that morning and declared to the Rector who had been discharged, von M6llendorf,2 who knew me especially well as a neighbor and who wanted to see me as his successor, and to Prorector Prelate Sauer,3 that I could not and did not want to assume the office. Both replied that I may not step back because everything was prepared for the most unanimous choice possible and, besides, there was the threat of the appoinment of an inferior old fighter.

But even as I said yes, I did not see beyond the university and did not notice what was actually happening. Not for a second did I think that my name could have such an effect upon the German, and now the world public, or would be decisive for many young men. Only now, the man who until last year had been Rector of the Technical University in Karlsruhe4 accounted to me and my wife how at that time, my assuming the Rectorship was discussed for days by the students in Berlin. I dreamed and thought fundamentally only about the university that I had a vague notion of, but I immediately fell into the machinery of the office: the influences, the power struggles, and the factions. I was lost and fell, if for only a few months, into what my wife describes as an "intoxication of power." I only began to see more clearly at Christmas of 1933; so, in February, I resigned under protest

from my office and declined to participate in the official transference of the Rectorship to my successor,' who, since 1946, is sitting in his office again. This step, in contrast, to be sure, to the discussion of my assumption of the Rectorship in the domestic and foreign press, was met with deathly silence. I do not flatter myself with this but, at that time, when Rectors stayed in office for three and five years, it was nevertheless a step-but the total organization of public opinion was already assured. An individual could by this time do nothing. What I have reported can excuse nothing; it can only explain to what extent and how from year to year, as more vis- ciousness came out, the sense of shame also grew over having here and there, directly and indirectly, contributed to it.

Then, where I tried with my modest knowledge and abilities to gain historical insight, I fundamentally failed. In the years 1937 and 1938, I reached the lowest point. We saw the war coming and, most immediately, the threat to our growing sons, neither of whom were in the Hitler Youth or in any student Party organization. A human being sees more clearly under such threats. Then came the persecution of the Jews, and everything fell into the abyss.

We never believed in victory and, if it had come to that point; we would have been the first to fall. I already knew that very clearly in the summer semester of 1937. At the time I was giving a Nietzsche seminar on "Being and Appearance." A certain Dr. Hanke, who introduced himself as a student of Nic. Hartmann, and who was highly gifted, participated in it. In the course of the first week, he came to me after being impressed with my presentations (one of them, on "Nihililsm," is in Holzwege6) and declared that he had to make a confidential confession: He was an informer for the Southern Section of the State Security Service (Stuttgart), and he had to tell me that I stood in a prominent position on their blacklist. At the outbreak of the war, Dr. H. quit the Security Service and was killed in the French campaign.

Once again, I do not write this in order to claim that I accomplished anything, although everyone who could hear clearly in the years 1935-44 could have known that, at this university, no one dared to do what I did. I

was then struck all the harder by what was undertaken against me in 1945-46 and, actually, to this hour. Even in 1945-46 I did not yet see what my step into the public domain in 1933 had meant. I only learned something of this since then, in connection with my questionable fame through existentialism. The guilt of the individual remains, and it remains all the more, the more individual he is, but the matter of this evil has not come to an end. It has now entered a genuinely global stage. In 1933 and before, the Jews and the politicians of the left, as those directly threatened, saw more clearly, more sharply, and more broadly.

Now it is our turn. I have no illusions. I know, from our son who has returned from Russia that my name even now stands at the front again, and that any day the threat can have its effects. Stalin doesn't need to declare war any longer. Every day he wins a battle, but one doesn't see it. For us, as well, there is no avoiding it, and every word and every piece of writing is in itself a counterattack, if all of this does not play itself out in the political, which itself has long been outplayed by other relations to being and leads a pseudoexistence.

I will closely study your writings; but, to be sure, I have over the years become ever more sparing and slow as a reader.

Your fine suggestion of coming to terms in letters, written at given times, is the only one possible, but it is the same old story: The more simple matters become, the more difficult it will be to think and to say what is appropriate to them. I often still dream about what would have happened had Schelling and Hegel rediscovered one another in the twenties of the previous century and had settled their fundamental position, not in a compromise, but in a grand style. To be sure, they each stand in a different dimension, and the historical analogy is an idle matter, besides.

Despite everything, dear Jaspers, despite death and tears, despite suffering and horror, despite misery and affliction, despite abysmalness and exile, in this homelessness there occurs not nothing, but an advent conceals itself there, whose furthest hints we may, perhaps, still experience in a light breath and which must be captured in order to preserve them for a future

that no historical construction, especially today's, which thinks technologically throughout, will decipher.

I heard that you will give lectures in Heidelberg in the summer. You will probably not want to stay over here in Freiburg but, if you travel through, let me know the time. I will come to the train and at least shake your hand once again.

I send sincere greetings to you and your dear wife
and in the name of my wife

Your Martin Heidegger

145. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Mef3kirch, May 12, 1950

Dear Jaspers!

I have come here for a few weeks in order to complete the new edition of my Kant book,' for which manuscripts are still stored here. I have brought your Question of German Guilt and the Introduction2 with me. In reading the latter, it was clear that this could help me, not to mention that it is a good occasion, with the aid of the Introduction, for me to bring myself closer to what is most essential and thus to what is most difficult in your thinking. From the Introduction, I only now see with complete clarity how decisively for you thinking is led by the lack and the possibility of communication. To be sure, I have not yet gone into it precisely or far enough to be able to judge it with certainty, and perhaps I am therefore running through an open door with the following question.

Would you not have to attempt to present the internal systematic of your philosophy, its construction and development, purely from the fundamental experience of communication? It seems to me that what is your own is still covered up too much through a traditional schematic of representations and distinctions. It is not a matter of purely presenting what is new in your thinking from this fundamental experience, but of bringing this thinking thus into a sharper impression against current thinking. It is formally the same question that I put to your Psychology of Worldviews3 30 years ago; however, materialiter and in position, it is completely different-but perhaps what I am looking for you have already done.

I have received a renewed invitation from the Heidelberg students to speak there in May or June. Before I decide and also choose the date, in case I say yes, I would like to know when you are going to be in Heidelberg.

With sincere greetings

Your

Martin Heidegger

146. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1*]

Basel, May 15, 1950

Dear Heidegger!

Tired after the work of the day, just a quick reply to your question: If I should speak in Heidelberg,' it will be shortly after July 15-whether I will speak is not yet finally determined because all of the technical requirements, for travel are not yet clear-but it is probable that I will go.

As to your contributing question about philosophizing: the Introduction is not intended to be an introduction to my philosophizing, which I hope does not exist-it is, by force of its task to reach people through the modern technical apparatus, an extreme simplification.

The theme of communication that you remarked upon is exhaustively discussed in my book On Truth3 (for example, in the alternative: catholicity and reason4), and in the second volume of my Philosophy.5

The presentation of philosophy from this fundamental experience would mean systematic thinking as a work, which is indeed foreign to me. Philosophizing always seems to me, as far as it enters the publicity of language, to be only one side of a reality that first becomes present when the other side is added by the reader or writer.

Materialiter, if I understand my work, it is still a matter of the same thing that is imparted for the first time in The Psychology of Worldviews, without any practice in the craft of philosophizing.

Whether your desire for a "sharper impression" is justified, I do not venture to decide. One probably still remains here far removed from what ought to be.

A covering up through a "traditional schematic of representations and distinctions" would certainly be repugnant to me, if it were a covering up. I only attempt to think primordially, not originally, and I don't believe I am moving in the space ofphilosophia perennis in order to make reality meaningful to me from there, according to my abilities, and to gain for myself the means for communication. What is traditional is so rich and essential that its appropriation in the widest scope, and in constant connection with the simple and the essential, is for me an indispensable requirement and nourishment for present insight. Disregard for distinctions that respectively belong to it seems to me to obscure our thinking today; e.g., in the dialectic, in the coincidentia oppositorum, in the ambiguity that is seized upon with pleasure, as the Marxists and the psychoanalysts do, creating a world of insincerity and deception. In so far as I speak the ancient language of philosophy, it seems to me that there is luminosity there. To be sure, your question can be appropriate in those cases where I might operate somewhat loosely with turns of speech instead of thinking-this can be made visible only in concerto. It would pertain to the accompanying debris, not to the subject matter, Your question should increase my conscientiousness.

I wish for a doctrine of categories and of method, on which I am still working, in order to come to the maximum level of clarity in what is sayable, but I do not wish for a work that would entirely stand objectively as philosophy.

The actual test in every repetition of traditional thoughts, it seems to me, is what they mean in the totality of their unique and common reality; i.e., what results from them, what is prevented and promoted by them, or how we really live with them. I will reply to your letter of April 8 at another time. My thanks today for both letters!

Sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

147. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, May 16, 1950

Dear Heidegger!

I still want to reply to both of your letters of April 8 and May 12. Today, only my thanks and the answer to your question about Heidelberg.

In case I speak there, it will be shortly after July 15-whether I will speak has not yet been finally determined. All of the technical requirements for travel are not yet clear (unfortunately they are today doubly difficult because of the bureaucracies and my great physical disability). But it is probable that I will go.

Best wishes for your work and sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

148. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg i. Br., May 26, 1950

Dear Jaspers!

Thank you for the information. I have just now declined the invitation to Heidelberg along with invitations to five other German universities. In July, I will presumably already be at the cabin.

With sincere greetings for Whitsun

Your

Martin Heidegger

149. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, July 24, 1952

Dear Heidegger!

It has been more than two years since I wrote to you: I still want to reply to your last letter. That this has not happened until today does not rest upon any intention. In the fall of 1950, I had prepared the papers' that were still necessary at the time and arranged the visit with Gentner,2 in order to also talk to you in Freiburg. Nothing came of it because I caught cold in St. Moritz,3 with the results4 that are always so bad with me. At the end of September, at the appointed time, I was certainly well, but I was very tired physically and I was in haste with preparations for the semester. I no longer dared to take the trip. I didn't write to you because I put it off as something not absolutely pressing. This hesitation was not only laziness, not only caused by the number of the questions raised (that you at one time wrote to me about: where to begin!5), but the essential reason was a self-consciousness that was evoked by the contents of your last letters, your discussions about 1933 and the following years, with which my memories did not completely agree, and in addition by superfluous scandalmongering by way of Heidelberg, 6 which I cannot go into and which Hannah? has settled-but now I finally want to write. I have for all too long, and not actually excusably, neglected it. My impulse is the good will from the consciousness of a duty that summons me from an indelible and distant past. If the vehicle of my writing remains stuck through self-consciousness and through not being able to correctly reply, I hope, nevertheless, that it could get underway again if I force it and if you help by your willingness to oblige.

Your letters from April and May 1950 are in front of me. When I read them just now, the self-consciousness immediately presented itself again. To me, it is as if you had not replied to me in something essential, in something that is to me perhaps indispensable (I had expected, after your

previous letters,8 in response to which I sent you my Question of German Guilt, a critical word about this little piece). Additionally, it is certainly the case that we know one another too little from our publications. Therefore, if we say anything to one another about them, something incidental and distorted will easily result-to be sure, not otherwise with me as with you.

What we both understand by philosophy, what we intend to do with it, whom we turn to with it, how it is connected with one's own life, all of that is presumably extraordinarily different with us, already in its origin. Clarifying this could lead to a fruitful discussion. I am not yet in any position to do this because I do not have sufficient knowledge of your writings, but what I do know leads me to occasionally make notes. Our differences make us apply obviously entirely different standards when reading a piece of philosophical writing. In spite of everything, there must be someplace where we could meet one another and, perhaps, even where we are bound together; otherwise, what was once possible would never be possible.

From your letters, I get something that is decisive between us personally over time, that is most separable, and comparatively to the point. You judge decisively about present events: "The matter of this evil has not come to an end"-yes, indeed, I think with you since 1945-but you see this evil in its global stage, in Stalin and corresponding realities. What this is and how it hangs together is shown to a good extent by the magnificent books of Hannah's but, apparently, you do not mean this. You write: "Stalin doesn't need to declare war any longer. Every. day he wins another battle, but one doesn't see this. For us, there is no avoiding it. And every word and every piece of writing is in itself a counterattack, if all of that does not play itself out in the sphere of the political, which itself has long been outplayed by other relations to being." I am horrified to read something like this.

If you were sitting in front of me, as you did decades ago, you would today experience my flood of words, in anger and in adjuration of reason. The questions are urgent for me: Does such a view of things, in its indeterminacy, promote destruction? Won't what it is possible to do be missed by the apparent grandeur of such visions? How is it that somewhere

you allowed a very positive judgement of Marxism to be published10 without clearly saying at the same time that you recognize the power of what is evil? Is not this power something for each of us first to come to grips with where it is present and, for him who speaks, something to come to grips with by speaking clearly and concretely? Is not this power of evil in Germany also what has constantly grown and, in fact, what prepares Stalin's victory: the concealing and forgetting of the past, the new so-called nationalism, the return of the old ruts of thinking and of all the ghosts which destroy us, even though they are empty? Is not this power in all thinking of the approximate (approximate because it runs parallel to the life and actions of the one who thinks)? Is Stalin not victorious precisely through all of this? Is not a philosophy that surmises and poetizes in such sentences in your letter, that produces a vision of something monstrous, is this not, in turn, something that prepares the victory of totalitarianism by separating itself from reality? Just as, before 1933, philosophy to a great extent actually made ready the acceptance of Hitler? Is something similar happening today? Is it not a terrible error that a spiritual accomplishment as such should already be a counterattack? Can it not be the other way around: as George and Rilke (not Hofmannsthal) promoted the human condition (naturally only through a small circle of the cultivated) in which one sacrificed oneself because one could not think any longer, avoided the either-or, and as these poets served as idols with whom one intended to internally resist the work of the devil?

Can the political, which you take to be outplayed, ever disappear? Has it not only changed its shape and its means? Must we not recognize precisely this?

Your write further: "In this homelessness ... an advent conceals itself." My horror grew when I read that. As far as I can understand, that is pure dreaming, in the order of many such dreamings thatalways at the moment-have made fools of us for the past half-century. Are you about to appear as a prophet who points to something supersensible on the basis of a secret revelation, as a philosospher who leads us away from reality? Who allows the possible to be neglected through fictions? With things like this, one wonders about authorization and rehabilitation....

I conclude by making a couple of points, entirely different, to be sure, and more hopeful than these points that once stood in my last real letter" (before 1949), around 1934. Today, unlike then, you should not insinuate a complete termination with only a slight hope. You may react this way, but you should infer that there is a chance we could still understand one another on the level of human measure and human possiblities.

You write a beautiful, true statement: "The more simple things become, the more difficult it will be to think and to say anything appropriate about them." This simple thing belongs to the concrete situation and finds its way from there into something sayable only in an objective form. That I have not been able until now to state this simple thing to you, and that I do not hear it from you, is for me an indication of what is entirely insufficient in my philosophizing. At this age, life is so short that every day is precious. One chooses what one takes to be most important. I hope to still live long enough that the moment will become ripe for me to read your writings completely and to say what appears to me to be the simple thing, and this essentially in order to hear your answer-but everything remains so uncertain.

With sincere greetings

Your Karl Jaspers

150. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

Freiburg, February 19, 1953

Dear Jaspers!

The joy and honor of those closest to you, and of your friends, will adorn your celebration day' as is your due.

Many who have been in discussion with you for a long time and who learn from you will make up the wider circle of the celebration and will think of you with thanks.

On this day, universities, the literary world, and learned bodies will show your work to those living today.

Everything that is in accordance with this day of commemoration and its festiveness will happen in a beautiful and dignified way.

In addition to this, someone will attempt to follow your path and, at the same time, test his own. Years commonly shared and painful events will be remembered, and the fate of different attempts at thinking will be endured, which strive, through questioning, to point to something essential in a quarrelsome and unstable world.

Such questioning can be so steadfast that it also seeks to determine of itself whether there does not remain a neighborliness in all of the different ways of thinking, which characterizes that closeness in which all who are united by the same matter and the same task stand in relation to one another in a fundamentally unrecognizable, and never transparent, manner.

Please accept this greeting from a wanderer. It includes the wish that you may retain the power and the confidence to help your fellow men find the clarity of the essential through your influence and achievement.

Your

Martin Heidegger

151. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

Basel, April 3, 1953

Dear Heidegger!

Thank you for your birthday wishes. You correctly predicted the kind feelings and the many gestures of friendship that are bestowed upon one who celebrates on such a day. I have always only been able to reply with a printed thank you. I am enclosing it,' but it is not so appropriate for you, for, in your letter, you feel yourself apart from these people, entirely alone, and perhaps rightly so.

There is a tone in your lines that I do not fail to hear. It leaves open what could still be possible between us. It stands differently between the two of us than between me and the philosophy professors, besides. Between us it stands completely or not at all, for conventional superficialities are prevented by what once was between us. I see you before me in the flesh, just as it once was, just as you were so often with me since 1920, just as we were together; I see your gestures, your look, hear your voice, remember concrete conversations and circumstances of conversations. There was that seriousness that you wanted to betray as little as I by passing over what was present, the immensity. In relation to this, we either stand together and speak of what is happening and is present, or we remain silent. Philosophy and politics have been inseparable since Plato and Kant. As it stands now, I would not know, out of perplexity, what there would be to say if we were to meet. My letters, especially the one from last summer, were questions. Without a plan, I pressed toward signs that a frame of mind was being prepared for a conversation that would have decisive consequences. Perhaps I am mistaken; now it seems to me as if these last years have brought no answers between us in what is essential. I myself am aware of my own inadequacy in those earlier years since 1920: my lack of strength for a penetrating and forceful openness. Had I been able, I would have taken hold of you, so to speak; I would have relentlessly questioned you

and made you take notice, and thus, perhaps, something decisively different may have been possible-but I had neither the strength nor the clear foresight. If we had to continually meet one another in the same place as colleagues, there would have resulted either a catastrophe or a solidarity that would have held firm in 1933. What has happened to us Germans since then cuts so deeply that we would both come together only in a common rediscovery of German rudiments, where German was not yet a political word and where Burkhardt could take it as his task to show the Swiss that they are Germane-a sentence that neither a Swiss nor a German can understand today and that Burkhardt would no longer have written after 1848, when he perceived where things were going.3 To philosophize within the entire scope of the world, as we have both striven to do, can, I think, only become true when the soil is true and with both of us the soil is German. Today, I see this soil becoming more and more boggy year after year, even, for example, in otherwise respectable periodicals that are full of intelligent, well-intended, and at times even meaningful thoughts, such as Merkur, Gegenwart, Frankfurter Hefte (which here and there cast a deep glance and, perhaps, bring the most important observations today). Half a year ago, I collected my numerous notes and notations about our German self-con- sciousness4 and set them aside. The situation is not encouraging. I intend to wait until the frame of mind which is possible for me has become even more untimely for the space of the occupied regions. Then I will, perhaps, be able to attain a few, but with utter probability many, individual things through decisiveness. Until then, I am also putting off saying anything about your philosophy, to which I am constantly driven, and prompting you, perhaps, to reply.

You speak of the neighborliness of even the most heterogeneous, of contact between those who are solitary. Yes, that will be true in the end, but we may not forestall it with preconditions. On the whole, silence allows what is possible in concrete human relations to be missed. Luther says, on the contrary, about this horrible, Luciferian, German fate: "We can pray with one another but not speak with one another. "5 We would have to call things what they are and not remain vague. We will reach the seriousness of what is still to be touched upon in thinking only by way of what is entirely concrete, present, and palpable in our existence with others.

Your letter keeps alive as a task what I cannot achieve at this time and what it, perhaps, will not be granted to me to do. Now I am pressed by a works that I would like to bring to a conclusion. It is still far from being finished and will certainly take two more years.

From old remembrances of you, unforgettable, and with best wishes for you

Your

Karl Jaspers

My powers are not sufficient to reply as I would like. I must ask all of my friends for their benevolence. Please excuse the fact that, for this time, I am only sending this dictation, even for you.

152. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1]

At present: Cannes'

September 22, 1959

Dear Heidegger!

I send you my greetings and best wishes for your seventieth birthday.3 Both are sincere, for the remembrance at this moment of a distant, noble past makes my personal feeling for you, which now had to remain silent for a long time, speak more strongly.

Since 1933, a desert has lain between us, which seemed to become ever more unpassable with what happened and what was said later. After this, which has become well known, a private meeting without any preceding clarity could, as I perceive, help but a little. Philosophy itself would have to speak. We are getting old, and I am not inconsiderably older than you. Perhaps what is appropriate remains unsaid.

So I stand before you with empty hands and can today only wish that you are granted an evening of life that is more fulfilling, more thoughtful, and more productive.

Your surroundings stand before my eyes. As an eighteen-year-old student, I was on the Feldberg for a winter week in 1901. There were few people there, pressed tightly together in the evenings in the old, small hotel, which one reached by sled in an hour-long journey. On skis, with which-unlike you-I could only move weakly and, therefore, laboriously and only in the vicinity of the hotel-I was enchanted in a snowstorm at sunset, as the world became nothing but mere shades of infinite, constantly changing light and color. Another time I saw the distant, luminous hills above the fog.

Your Karl Jaspers4

153. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO KARL JASPERS

For

Karl Jaspers on his eightieth birthday'

That you were able to arrive where your thinking established an abode for contemplation, and that you were able to dwell there, for this you give today your thinking thanks.

> He lives from silence and for it. He cherishes the indestructible. He builds every hour upon the distant nearness of the originary. He knows thinking as the effectless perseverence in a once-borne determination. May thanking in thinking be your joy on this day.

In remembrance of the twenties of this raging century

Martin Heidegger

154. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDDEGGER

Basel, March 25, 1963

Dear Heidegger!

After a flu that lasted for weeks, I can now finally thank you for thinking of my eightieth birthday.

To be sure, I experienced a slight uneasiness, for the document is too ceremonious for my nature-but I was more pleased because I sensed that we could meet one another for a meaningful struggle in a region where those places that you write about are located. That will indeed hardly happen now. If it did, then only from there would a light be cast from each side upon the work and the personal reality through which we appear.

I greet you with best wishes

Karl Jaspers

155. KARL JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER[1*]

Basel, March 2619632

Dear Heidegger!

After a two-week flu, from which I am recovering still with a slight fever, I can finally write to you.

It was a pleasure for me that you sent me greetings for my eightieth birthday. I thank you. There is still something between us as a remembrance and a claim. I read your words "In remembrance of the twenties of this raging century" with emotion.

At my age, I push perhaps even more toward openness. I would not like to keep silent and to pass over in silence what allows itself to be said. In reading the document you wrote for my birthday, I felt an uneasiness. It was too ceremonious for me. It eased in part when I thought I could meet you in a region where the places are located that you write about. That distinguishes us from our colleagues, the philosophy professors, to whom we both nevertheless belong.

In those places, entered through a scarcely communicable experience and fictively treated in thinking, perhaps what plays itself out is something not decided in the course of things, but certainly in the course of the individual and his communication. Perhaps the waves of thought that we produce or originarily repeat carry something upon their surface, in any case uncommonly tiny to other people. To what extent the course of human history is moved by this is an empirical question. What Hegel and Nietzsche and, most crudely, Marx think on this point, I take to be a presumption that is ruinous to us human beings.

You, if I have understood something, do not think so, but with what you say and how you say it, you expect me to experience that abode that you believe (for me astonishing and unintelligible) to have been established by

my thinking in the same way as you. You say, it seems to me, what pertains to you, not to me, what you, not I, do there and find there. Almost every sentence that you write to me I would not, so to speak, invert into its opposite through contradiction, but I would put them into question from a ground that-perhaps foolishly-seems to me to lie deeper.

You strengthen in me the impulse to meet you once again in a few critical discussions of your work and your reality. The impulse was already there thirteen years ago and then disappeared again. If we should prompt one another in that region, speak from it or toward it, which you would no longer call metaphysics, then a level of struggle and possible agreement could be entered which today is the only thing philosophically worth while. There one hardly meets anyone, but from there comes what determines us even in our everyday lives, allows our actions and our judgments to become signs of what would be luminous there for us.

Perhaps it would be meaningful if I were to say a word to you according to Nietzsche's axiom: "Whom I attack I honor"-but my age prolongs every action. I am still internally captivated with my book on the great philosophers (it is curious that, a short time ago, I read that you advised me, after my Philosophy in 1932, to write the book, the first volume of which had been published years before),3 but it probably no longer comes to this word. Should it be the case, however, I think: You are younger and would still be able to answer.

However, today I thank you. I am sending you a little book' that has just appeared, consisting mostly of previously published essays whose content is political. What stands in them is not developed directly from philosophizing, but it is motivated by what was experienced in philosophizing. It throws light back upon this. I cannot separate them at the root. Perhaps to you this will seem unfitting.

I greet you from afar distance, not forgetting, forgetting nothing, but always restless that it could still be possible against all appearances to find once again, through an exhaustive, material discus sion-as far as one can at all materially speak of philosophizing in the popular sense-that human place

which commonly appeared to us for a brief moment in 1923, according to letters that I have just read again and which reminded me.

With best wishes to you

Karl Jaspers'

156. MARTIN HEIDEGGER TO GERTRUD JASPERS

[Sympathy telegram, sent on March 2, 1969]

In remembrance of earlier years, in honor and sympathy

Martin Heidegger

157. GERTRUD JASPERS TO MARTIN HEIDEGGER

[Telegram] [March 2, 1969]

Thinking likewise of the earlier years, I thank you.

APPENDIX

A so-called Cleansing Committee, consisting of Professors Constantin von Dietze, Gerhard Ritter, Adolf Lampe and, later, Arthur Allgeier and Friedrich Oehlkers, represented Freiburg University in respect to all affairs of the French military government. Its main task was to make available expert judgments for the purpose of politically cleansing the professorate. Consequently, in October 1945, with the consent of the French military government, he was placed in second position on an appointment list in Tubingen. Protests by professors of Freiburg University had the effect that the Cleansing Committee met again on Heidegger and decided to take harsher measures against him. Thereafter, at the direction of the committee, Friedrich Oehlkers addressed the following inquiry to Jaspers in a letter from December 15, 1945:

> We want, beyond the facts of his rectorship, to come to a judgment about him that is as just as possible; for, in the usual sense of the word, he is certainly not a "Nazi."I cannot personally remain aloof from the tragedy that overshadowed his figure as Rector. He was simply unpolitical through and through, and the National Socialism which he embraced had little in common with the real one. He acted as Rector from this vacuum, inflicted horrific damage on the university, and suddenly saw the broken pieces lying all around him. He is only now beginning to grasp how it came about. All of this is easy to judge, but very difficult to actually understand. And so also his anti-Semitism against his friends is held up as complaisance with National Socialism. To this, he himself replies that, once he had decided to become Rector, he had to exercise restraint (sic!). He had never been an anti-Semite. He requests that we ask you about this point, specifically.

I repeat: what we want from you, as far as you have the time and the inclination, is a general characterization of the entire matter as you see it.

Heidelberg, December 22, 1945

Dear and esteemed Herr Oehlkers!

Your letter of December 15 reached me today.

I want to answer the main question of your letter immediately. Due to my earlier friendship with Heidegger, and also not to conceal any possible bias in my judgment, I cannot avoid touching upon personal matters. You are right to call the situation complicated. As with everything complicated, one must try to reduce it to what is simple and decisive, so as not to get caught in the thicket of complications. Please allow me to articulate a few main points separately:

1) I had hoped to be able to keep silent, except to trusted friends. I thought this way since 1933, when, after a terrible disappointment, I resolved to be silent out of faithfulness to good memories. That was easy for me because, in our last conversation in 1933, Heidegger kept silent about delicate questions, or answered imprecisely-especially on the Jewish question and because he did not continue the visits he had regularly made for a decade, so we never saw each other again. To be sure, he sent me his publications to the last, but, in 1937 and 1938, he no longer confirmed receipt of what I sent him. Now I had hoped more than ever to be able to keep silent. But now you ask me to express my opinion, not only officially on behalf of Herr von Dietze, but also in reference to Heidegger's request. That forces me to respond.

2) In addition to what is publicly known, I became aware of a number of facts, two of which I find to be important enough to impart.

On behalf of the National Socialist regime, Heidegger submitted a letter of evaluation on Baumgarten to the Dozents, Association of Gottingen, a copy of which was made known to me many years ago. In it are the

following sentences: "Here, Baumgarten was at all events anything but a National Socialist. Through family connections and in intellectual attitude, he comes from the liberal democratic circle of Heidelberg intellectuals surrounding Max Weber. After failing with me, he quickly established connections with the Jew Fraenkel, who previously taught at Gottingen and has now been dismissed here. Through him, he arranged for accomodations in Gottingen. Of course, judgment in his case cannot yet be concluded. He could still develop; however, we must wait for an appropriate probationary period before he is admitted into an organization of the National Socialist party." Today we have become accustomed to atrocities compared to which you will, perhaps, hardly understand the horror that gripped me when I read these sentences.

Heidegger's Assistant in the philosophy department, Dr. Brock, was a Jew. This fact was not known to Heidegger when he was appointed. As a consequence of National Socialist measures, Brock had to leave his position. On Brock's account, which I heard directly from his mouth, Heidegger's treatment of him was beyond reproach. Through positive recommendations, he made it easier for Brock to escape to England.

In the 1920s, Heidegger was no anti-Semite. The thoroughly gratuitous remark about the Jew Fraenkel shows that in 1933 he had become an anti-Semite, at least in certain connections. On this question, he did not just exercise restraint. That does not preclude that, as I must assume, in other cases anti-Semitism went against his conscience and his sense of taste.

3) Heidegger is a significant power, not by content of a philosophical worldview, but in his wielding of speculative tools. He possesses a philosophical organ whose perceptions are interesting, although in my opinion he is exceptionally uncritical and is far removed from real science. At times he operates as if he were combining the seriousness of nihilism with the mystagogy of a sorcerer. In the current of his linguisticality, he is occasionally able to strike the nerve of philosophizing in a way that is hidden and magnificent. In this, as far as I can see, he is perhaps alone among contemporary philosophers in Germany; therefore, it is urgently to be

wished and requested that he remain in position to work and to write what he can.

4) In dealing with individual people, it is unavoidable that we keep our general situation in view.

Thus it is indispensable that whoever contributed to putting National Socialism in the saddle is called to account. Heidegger is among the few professors who did that.

The severity of excluding large numbers of people from their positions who, internally, were not National Socialists is widespread today. What would his colleagues say who must leave, must fall into misery, and who never commited acts on behalf of National Socialism if Heidegger remains without restriction! His extraordinary intellectual achievement can be a justifiable reason for making it possible for him to carry on with his work, but not for the continuation of his office and teaching activities.

In our situation, the education of the young is to be handled with the utmost responsibility. Complete freedom to teach is something to be sought, but it cannot be immediately produced. Heidegger's manner of thinking, which seems to me in its essence unfree, dictatorial, and without communication, would be fatal today in its pedagogical effects. The manner of thinking seems more important to me than the content of political judgments, whose aggressivity can easily change direction. As long as there is in him no genuine rebirth that is visible in his work, such a teacher, in my opinion, cannot be placed before today's youth, who are spiritually almost defenseless. The youth must first learn to think for themselves.

5) I acknowledge to a certain extent the personal excuse that Heidegger is by nature apolitical; the National Socialism that he embraced had little to do with real National Socialism. In answer to this, I would first recall a saying of Max Weber's from 1919: "Children who reach into the wheel of world history are dashed to pieces." Second, I would make the qualification that Heidegger had certainly not seen through the real powers and goals of the National Socialist leaders. That he believed he was allowed to have his own will shows this, but his way of speaking and his actions have a certain

affinity with National Socialist phenomena, which make his error understandable. He and Baeumler and Carl Schmitt are-very different professors among themselves-the ones who attempted to intellectually lead the National Socialist movement. In vain. They deployed real intellectual ability and ruined the reputation of German philosophy. A feature of the tragedy of evil emerges from this, which I perceive along with you.

A change of mind effected by switching over to the anti-National Socialist camp is to be judged according to its motives, which can in part be inferred at specific points in time. The years 1934, 1938, and 1941 signify fundamentally different stages. In my opinion, a change of mind is nearly meaningless for reaching a judgment if it only followed after 1941, and it is of little use if it did not radically occur after June 30, 1934.

6) For unusual cases, an unusual arrangement can be found if we want to do so because the case is really important. Therefore my recommendation is:

a) Provision of a personal pension for Heidegger for the purpose of allowing him to continue his philosophical labors and to publish his works, on the basis of his recognized achievements and the expectation that important things are still to come.

b) Suspension from teaching for several years. Then reexamination on the basis of publications that have appeared in the meantime and the renovated academic conditions. Then it must be asked whether a complete restoration of the freedom to teach can be risked, when this freedom may allow what is hostile and dangerous to the idea of the university to have an effect, especially when it would be represented by a person of intellectual rank. Whether such a situation will come to pass depends upon the course of political events and upon the development of our public spirit.

In the case that such an expressly unique disposition for Heidegger were to be refused, I would consider any preferential treatment for him within the bounds of the usual measures to be unjustified.

With that, I have expressed my opinion with a concision that is certainly full of possible misunderstandings. In case you want to let Heidegger know about this letter, I give you my permission to convey to him a copy of points 1, 2, and 6, and the passage "Therefore it is ... he can." from point 3.

Please excuse the apodictic form along with the concision. I would rather discuss the matter back and forth with you, and further clarify my opinion when I heard how you understood me. But that is not possible now.

My sincere regards to you and your esteemed, dear wife from my wife

and your

Karl Jaspers

[Handwritten addendum]:

12/24 Because a Sunday came in between, the letter remained here. I was able to consider whether, in respect to my earlier relations with Heidegger, I should ask you to forgo an answer from me. To answer and not to answer are both, in this case, against my nature. Finally, the summons of an official authority prevailed and, above all, the summons of Heidegger himself. So I am sending the letter.

NOTES

1

1. Spengler lectures: In Wiesbaden, during the course of an "academic week" in the middle of April 1920, organized by the Society for University Studies. Born the physicist, Oncken the historian, and Wolzendorff the constitutional scholar also spoke there. Heidegger spoke on Wednesday, April 14, on Oswald Spengler and his work, The Decline of the West. The proceeds from the lecture series went to the Wiesbaden Society for the Summer Care of Poor Children.

2. "That morning" refers to Heidegger's visit with Jaspers. See note 2 to Jaspers's letter of January 21, 1921.

3. During 1921-22, Heidegger worked on his "Comments on Karl Jaspers' Psychology of Worldviews for the Gottingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen; however, they were not published there but first appeared in Karl Jaspers in der Diskussion, edited by H. Saner, Munich, 1973, pp. 70-100 (on the very point, p. 100) and in GA 9, Wegmarken. English: see Pathmarks.

2

1. On Friedrich Neumann, cf. the following letter from Heidegger.

2. Just when this "singular discussion" took place cannot be firmly established. Heidegger writes on the preceding postcard about "the evening ... with you," thus in Heidelberg. According to Jaspers (Pbilosophiscbe Autobiographie, expanded new edition, Munich, 1977, p. 92f) the first conversation took place in Heidegger's "den" in Freiburg: "In early 1920, my wife and I were in Freiburg for a few days to take the occasion to speak with Husserl and Heidegger. Husserl's birthday was being celebrated. We sat in a

large circle around the coffee table. On that occasion, Frau Husserl called Heidegger `the phenomenological child.' I told him that a female student of mine, Afra Geiger, a personality of the first rank, had come to Freiburg to study with Husserl, but he rejected her according to the rules of admission into his seminar. So a good opportunity was lost to him and to her due to an academic schematism, because he neglected to see the person herself. Heidegger actively and confirm- ingly chimed in with me. There was something like a solidarity of the two younger ones against the authority of abstract regulations ... Only Heidegger seemed different to me. I visited him, sat alone with him in his den, saw him studying Luther, saw the intensity of his work, and had sympathy for the penetrating brevity of his way of speaking." Heidegger's first visit to Heidelberg must have taken place soon after Jaspers's visit in Freiburg, around April 8 (Husserl's birthday).

3

1. Fr. Neumann studied with Heidegger in Freiburg i. Br.

2. Edmund Husserl, 1859-1938; founder of phenomenology; since 1916, an Ordinarius in Freiburg i. Br. Recognized early on the significance of Heidegger, whom he took as an assistant at the beginning of January 1919. Being and Time is dedicated to him. Husserl recommended Heidegger as his successor. After 1930, there was a falling out between them, which first became evident in the afterword of the Ideas in the Jahrbuch fur Philosophie and phanomenologische Forschung, vol. 11, Halle a. d. S. 1930, pp. 549-70- now in Husserliana, vol. 5, ed. Marly Biemel, the Hague, 1952, pp. 138-62. English: Phenomenology and the Foundations of the Sciences, trans. Ted E. Klein and William E. Pohl, the Hague: Nijhoff, 1980. Heidegger was also the co-editor of the Jahrbuch. For Heidegger's critique of phenomenology, see GA 20, Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs, sec. 11. English: History of the Concept of Time.- Prolegomena.

3. Wilhelm Dilthey, 1833-1911; originator of the theory of the human sciences. He welcomed the development of phenomenology but felt him self to be misunderstood after the appearance of Husserl's "Philosophie als strenge Wissenschaff in Logos, vol. 1, Tubingen, 1910-11, no. 3, pp. 289-

341. English: "Philosophy as Rigorous Science" in Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy, trans. Quentin Lauer, New York: Harper & Row, 1965, pp. 71-147. See the Briefwechsel Dilthey-Husserl in Revista de Filosofia de la Universidad de Costa Rica, vol. 1, no. 2, 1957, ed. Walter Biemel, pp. 101-24, and in Man and World, vol. 1, no. 3, 1968, pp. 428-66.

4. Scheyer studied in Freiburg i. Br.

5. Karl LOwith, 1897-1973; student of Heidegger; emigrated in 1933, first to Italy, then to Japan and the United States. After the war, professor in Heidelberg. Published, among other things, Von Hegel zu Nietzsche, [From Hegel to Nietzsche] Stuttgart, 5th ed. 1964; Weltgeschichte and Heilsgeschehen, Stuttgart, 4th ed. 1961; Martin Heidegger, Denker in durftiger Zeit, (Stuttgart, 3d ed. 1963).

6. Afra Geiger, Jewish friend of Gertrud Jaspers, student of Jaspers and Heidegger, died in Ravensbriick concentration camp.

7. Heinrich Finke, 1855-1938; Catholic historian; in 1891 professor in Munster; from 1899 in Freiburg i. Br.; from 1924 president of the Gorres Society.

8. In reference to The Psychology of Worldviews.

4

1. Karl Jaspers, The Psychology of Worldviews.

5

1. Refers to the review of The Psychology of Worldviews. See note 3 to the postcard of April 21, 1920.

2. Heinrich Rickert, 1863-1936; the founder, with Windelband, of the Southwest School of Neokantianism; Professor in Freiburg i. Br. and from 1916 in Heidelberg. Heidegger dedicated his Habilitationschrift to him but

later distanced himself from his philosophizing. See History of the Concept of Time sec. 4 (d), and sec. 5 (b).

3. Now GA 61, Phanomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristotles-Einfuhrung in die phanomenologische Forschung.

4. Elfride Heidegger, nee Petri, born on July 3, 1893, in Leisnig-Sachsten.

5. In May of 1921, Jaspers was offered the chair of philosophy at the University of Greifswald and an Ordinariat in Kiel in June. Jaspers declined both and assumed the personal Ordinariat in philosophy at Heidelberg.

6

1. The review of The Psychology of Worldviews.

2. Julius Springer, Berlin; the second, revised edition appeared there in 1922.

7

1. Since April 1, 1920, Jaspers was a budgetary Extraordinarius in philosophy as the successor to Hans Driesch. This position became open on October 1, 1921, because a personal Ordinariat was given to him in case he stayed in Heidelberg.

2. Richard Kroner, 1884-1974; since 1919 Extraordinarius in philosophy in Freiburg i. Br. From 1924 professor in Dresden; 1929-35 in Kiel; in 1938 emigrated to Great Britain, and in 1941 to the United States, where he taught at the Theological Seminary in New York. Kroner came out of "Southwestern" Neokantianism but then became one of the central figures of Neohegelianism. Cf. his two-volume main work, Von Kant bis Hegel (Tubingen, 1921-24).

3. The critique of The Psychology of Worldviews.

4. Compare this with the later, diverging judgments,

Karl Jaspers, Philosophische Autobiographie (see note 2 to Jaspers's letter of January 21, 1921), p. 95:

> I failed on an essential point already in the early years. When we first met, my Psychology of Worldviews had already appeared. While the book found many readers, it was rejected by the guild of professional philosophers, undermined first of all by Rickert, under viewpoints that were foreign to my writing. Heidegger had read the book in an uncommonly thorough fashion, affirmed it to me as a new beginning and, in an unpublished critique, put it more unsparingly into question than all of the others. He gave me the manuscript of this critique. It seemed unjust to me; I read it fleetingly, and it wasn't fruitful. I took other paths than the ones he suggested, but I also had no desire to get taken up by this critique, to come to terms with it and to clarify in discussion what the foreignness of willing and questioning and challenging consisted of. For I would not at that time have been able to do it easily, since my philosophical efforts were in statu nascendi and involuntarily kept their distance from what did not nourish them.

In later years, Jaspers attached the following note to the manuscript of the review:

> At that time, Heidegger sent me these comments.
>
> At the time I hardly read them; this kind of critique did not interest me.
>
> The bad typewriter made reading difficult.
>
> I stopped after a few pages.
>
> This did not lie upon the path from whence I was searching and exerting myself.

My nonreaction, so I think today, must have affected Heidegger at the time. He did not complain, even indirectly, but now it seems to me that an `estrangement' emanated from him, because I did not go along with his path of thinking.

5. Cf. Martin Heidegger, "Comments on Karl Jaspers's Psychology of Worldviews" in Pathmarks.

8

1. The Extraordinariat occupied by Jaspers (see note 1 to Letter 7).

2. Karl Mannheim, 1893-1947; sociologist. 1926-30 Ph.D. in Heidelberg, then Ordinarius in Frankfurt a. M., from whence he emigrated to Great Britain in 1933. The sociology of knowledge.

9

1. Jaspers's writing, Strandberg and van Gogh.

2. This plan was not carried out.

10

1. Karl Jaspers, General Psychopathology, first published in Berlin in 1923. The "second, revised edition" appeared in 1920. At the time of this letter, he may have prepared the "third, expanded and improved" edition (1923).

2. On this, see Jaspers, Philosophische Autobiographie, pp. 40ff:

Around 1920, I stood before a crossroads. My Psychology of Worldviews had been successful. It was much read at the time. During the years that it came into being, lecture-manuscripts on the psychology of religion, social and national psychology, and moral psychology were accruing at the same time. There would have been

no difficulties in completing three new books. A vast literature could have been used to achieve a presentation with a broad horizon. The level that I had reached, of a perhaps substantial but philosophically ungrounded method of reflection, could have been broadly developed. There was great temptation to bring out, every year or two, such books that would have been successful for the moment. But my consciousness that what was alive in my inner constitution, in my estimation of people and things, would not become clear in thought if I took this path, resisted this. The substitution of such a broad psychological reflection, using ever so interesting historical materials, for philosophy, was neverthless an avoidance of the seriousness of being obligated to understand oneself in one's existence. It would have remained a nonbinding occupation with a mere profusion of objects. The task that I set for myself required my own methodological consciousness and penetration into the few originary and great philosophical works; and, further, my occupation even with history and the realities that are known from all of the sciences was only provisional and belonged to the more weary hours. The main thing became to climb further up the heights of authentic philosophy. It went slowly. The sudden intuitions as to what it was a question about gained stability and coherence only through work that contained a new character. Learning and the increase of knowledge could not do it, but only the forms of thought and methods of operation that are practiced in association with great philosophers and which cannot actually be learned. I had to win a different level of thinking. That meant the decision as to how to begin in advance.

3. Emil Kraepelin, 1856-1926; one of the most significant representatives of clinical psychiatry. He wrote the Lehrbuch der Psychiatrie (1883, 9th ed., 1927), which set the standard for Jaspers's General Psychopathology.

12

1. Paul Natorp, 1854-1924; professor in Marburg, Neokantian, student of Cohen. Upon his recommendation, Heidegger received the call to Marburg. Heidegger valued Natorp's book, Platos Ideenlehre (Leipzig, 1903).

2. Georg Misch, 1878-1965; professor in Gottingen; from 1939-46 in Great Britain. Representative of Lebens-Philosophie and editor of the Dilthey editions.

3. Probably refers to Kroner's work Von Kant his Hegel, (Tubingen, 1921-24, 2 vols.).

4. The lessons for beginners dealt with Husserl's Ideen zu einer reinen Phanomenologie and phanomenologischen Philosophie, vol. 1; the lessons for advanced sudents dealt with Aristotle's Physics, IV and V.

5. Moritz Geiger, 1889-1937; phenomenologist of the Munich school, with emphasis on aesthetics; co-editor of the Jahrbuch furPhilosophie and phanomenologische Forschung.

6. The children: Jorg, born in 1919, and Hermann, born in 1920. The cabin in Todtnauberg was built and occupied in 1922.

7. It cannot be determined with certainty which writing of Max Scheler's this is, but probably Die deutsche Philosophie der Gegenwart, which appeared in 1922 in the volume Deutsches Leben der Gegenwart, edited by Ph. Witkop.

Max Scheler, 1874-1928; professor in Cologne and in Frankfurt a. M.; major works: Der Formalismus in der Ethik and die materiale Wertethik [Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values] (Halle a. d. S., 1913-16); Wesen and Formen der Sympathie [The Nature of Sympathy] (Bonn, 2d ed., 1923); Die Wissensformen and die Gesellschaft [The Forms of Knowledge and Society] (Leipzig, 1926). Heidegger dedicated Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics to him.

8. The lessons on Aristotle, The Nicomachean Ethics.

13

1. Jaspers wrote, "by M. H. and K. J."

2. Max Weber, 1864-1920; historian, social economist, and sociologist; he exerted a lasting influence upon Jaspers and was for him the most significant personality of contemporary German intellectual life.

3. Walther Rathenau, 1867-1922; Jewish industrialist and politician, ultimately imperial foreign minister; was shot to death on June 24, 1922, on the way to the foreign office. Rathenau also left behind a multivolumed literary work, whose middle point is the search for a new economy and a new civil and social order, beyond the models of capitalism and socialism.

4. Both were seen by Jaspers as heterogeneous intellectual figures: Max Weber was nationally minded but never took a political office, while Walther Rathenau was, at the time, a "politician of accomplishment" who occupied a high political office but was ostracized by nationalist and antiSemitic circles.

5. Erich Wende, 1884-1966; was involved with the Prussian Ministry of Culture from 1913 to 1933, most importantly in the development of the universities and the founding of pedagogical academies, ultimately as Ministerial Director.

6. Carl Heinrich Becker, 1876-1933; orientalist and Prussian politician; from 1916 in the Ministry of Culture; was Minister of Culture in 1921 and from 1925-30. He constantly demanded reform of institutions of higher learning and was the founder of the first pedagogical academies and the German Academy for Poets.

7. In the summer semester of 1922, Jaspers lectured on the history of modern philosophy.

8. Franz Overbeck, 1837-1905; protestant theologian; from 1870 to 1897 Professor for New Testament and Early Church History in Basel; was a friend of Nietzsche. Jaspers is talking about the book Christentum and Kultur. Gedanken and Anmerkungen zur modernen Theologie von Franz Overbeck, edited from the Nachlass by Carl Albrecht Bernoulli (Basel, 1919).

1. General Psychopathology.

2. Gerdy Walther, 1897-1977; student of Husserl and Pf finder. Zur Ontologie der sozialen Gemeinschaften, in Iabrbuch fur Philosophie and phanomenologische Forschung, vol. 6 (Halle a. d. S., 1923). Later also attempted to apply phenomenology to the mystical realm.

3. Ricarda Huch, 1864-1947; historian, novelist, and poet; left the Prussian Academy of the Arts in 1933 in protest against National Socialism. DergroJe Krieg in Deutschland, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1912-14); Die Romantik, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1899-1902).

4. Hedwig Conrad-Martius, 1888-1966; representative of the Gottingen school of phenomenology; investigated principles of being and essence, especially the concept of reality. Realontologie, in Jahrbuch fi rPhilosophie and phanomenologische Forschung, vol. 6 (Halle a. d. S., 1923); Farben, in Husserl Festschrift (Halle a. d. S., 1929); Der Selbstaujbau der Natur (Hamburg, 1944); Die Zeit (Munich, 1954).

15

1. See letter 7 from August 1, 1921, from Jaspers to Heidegger.

2. Hermann Oncken, 1869-1945; historian; like Jaspers, came from Oldenburg. Professorships in Chicago (1905-1906), Giegen (1906), Heidelberg (1907-23 in modern history), Munich (1923) and Berlin (1928-35), where he was made to take early retirement. Oncken strove for an objectification of political history beyond any metaphysical superimpositions.

3. On occasion of the offer of appointments to the Universities of Kiel and Greifswald.

4. Ludwig Curtius, 1874-1954; classical archaeologist; taught in Heidelberg in 1920-28 after professorships in Erlangen and Freiburg i. Br., and was later named first director of the Archaeological Institute in Rome; considered one of the most significant and comprehensive interpreters of

archaeology. About his relations with Jaspers, with whom he was a close friend, see his Deutsche and antike Welt. Lebenserinnerungen (Stuttgart, 1950), pp. 365ff.

16

1. Werner Richter, 1887-1960; Germanist and cultural politician; was the Ministerial Director of the Prussian Ministry for Science, Art, and Public Education from 1925 to 1932.

2. Nicolai Hartmann, 1882-1950; professor in Marburg, Cologne, Berlin, Gottingen. Closely affiliated with the Marburg school; produced a new ontology: Grundzuge einer Metaphysik der Erkenntnis (Berlin and Leipzig, 2d, expanded edition, 1925); Zur Grundlegung der Ontologie (Meisenheim, 3d edition, 1948); Moglichkeit and Wirklichkeit (Berlin, 1938); Der Aujbau der realen Welt (Meisenheim, 2d edition, 1949); influenced by Scheler in his ethics of material values; Ethik (Berlin, 3d edition, 1949).

3. It is unclear what this remark is in reference to.

4. Under the title "Ontology," Heidegger lectured on Aristotle's hermeneutics of facticity-now GA 63, ed. Kate BrOcker-Oltmanns (Frankfurt a. M., 1988). The seminar for beginners dealt with Husserl's Logical Investigations, vol. 2 (presumably the Sixth Investigation), the colloquium (with Ebbinghaus) was on selected texts from Kant's Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone.

5. Husserl received an offer of appointment to the University of Berlin on July 4, 1923, as the successor to Ernst Troeltsch.

17

1. Einfiihrung in die phanomenologische Forschung (Introduction to Phenomenological Research). Lecture course, winter semester 1923-24, GA 17 ed. F.-W. v. Herrmann, 1994.

2. Jaspers, The Idea of the University (1923).

3. Wilhelm Szilasi, 1889-1966; student of Husserl's, friend of Heidegger; after Heidegger's prohibition from teaching, took over Heidegger's position in 1947. Macht and Ohnmacht des Geistes, Bern 1946; Einleitung in die Phanomenologie Husserls (Tubingen, 1959).

18

1. Friedrich Heidegger, 1851-1924; sexton and master cooper in Megkirch.

19

1. For Jaspers, The Idea of the University must have produced the first passing cloud over his friendship with Heidegger. See his Philosophische Autobiographie, p. 97.

20

1. Jaspers's Kant lecture on the occasion of the celebration of Kant's 200th birthday in Heidelberg.

21

1. Not found in Jaspers's papers.

2. Walther Marseille took his degree under Heidegger in 1926.

3. Heidegger wrote "hert" [Abbrevation for sincere].

22

1. Emil Lederer, 1882-1939; political economist; 1918-31 professor of political economy in Heidelberg, subsequently professor of political science

in Berlin; emigrated in 1933 to New York, where he was a professor at the New School for Social Research.

2. Robert HeiI, 1903-74; student of Heidegger's, later professor of psychology in Freiburg i. Br. Published, inter alia: Logik des Widerspruchs (Berlin and Leipzig, 1932); Der Gang des Geistes (Bern, 1948); Die groflen Dialektiker des 19. Jh: Hegel, Kierkegaard, Marx (Cologne and Berlin, 1963).

3. Rudolf Bultmann, 1884-1976; professor of theology in Marburg. Representative of demythologization. Published, inter alia: Offenbarung and Heilsgeschehen (Munich, 1941); Das Evangelium des Johannes (Gottingen, 10th ed., 1941); Glauben and Verstehen (Tubingen, vol. 1 1933, vol. 2 1952, vol. 3 1960, vol. 4 1965). He entered into a long friendship with Heidegger in Marburg.

23

1. Not found among Heidegger's papers.

2. Refers to a series of publications entitled Philosophische Forschungen with Julius Springer in Berlin, which Jaspers edited as a series of dissertations by his students. The first two volumes appeared in 1925.

3. History of the Concept of Time.

4. Erich Rudolf Jaensch, 1883-1940; professor in Marburg-main emphasis upon the psychology of perception (eidetics).

5. Nicolai Hartmann assumed the appointment to Cologne in 1925.

Following are some details as to the plan to offer Heidegger the Ordinariat as the successor to Hartmann. In the protocol of the second meeting of the committee for the new appointment of the Ordinariat on June 24, 1925, there is the following entry:

> Wedekind asks which of Heidegger's writings have been published. Hartmann answers that there is a new and outstanding work by Heidegger but that, nevertheless, as with his earlier work [on Aristotle], it has not yet been published.

On August 5, the philosophical faculty of the University of Marburg recommended Heidegger in first place to succeed Nicolai Hartmann to the Prussian Minister of Culture. On January 27, 1926, Minister C. H. Becker wrote to Marburg:

> While acknowledging Professor Heidegger's success as a teacher, it seems nevertheless inappropriate to transfer to him a budgetary, Ordinary Professorship with the historical significance of the Marburg position before an extensive literary accomplishment finds specific acknowledgement, demanding such appointment, by members of the discipline.
>
> On June 18, the Philosophy Faculty writes again to the Ministry in Berlin, and requests the Herr Minister, once again, to appoint Professor Heidegger, who was named in first place on the list of August 5, 1925. The Faculty believes itself to be justified in this request, since, in the meantime, Herr Heidegger has sent to print his work Being and Time. This work, in duplicate print sheets, is attached to this petition.

On November 25, the Minister again rejected the recommendation and sent back the print sheets.

After another recommendation from the faculty, Heidegger received the Ordinariat on October 19, 1927 (see Letter 49). My thanks to Ted Kisiel, who discovered these materials.

6. Ernst Cassirer, 1874-1945; philosopher; 1919-33 professor in Hamburg, later emigrated to various European countries and in 1941 to the United States. Published, inter alia: Philosophie der symbolischen Formen (Berlin, 1923-29) 3 vols.; Substanzbegriff and Funktionsbegriff (Berlin,

1910); Das Erkenntnisproblem in der Philosophie and Wissenschaft der neueren Zeit (Berlin, 1906-20), 3 vols.

7. Max Wundt, 1879-1963; philosopher; professor in Tubingen from 1929. Works on German Idealism and German Scholasticism.

8. Bruno Bauch, 1877-1942; philosopher; professor in Jena. Main emphasis on the theory of culture.

9. Heinrich Scholz, 1884-1956; theologian and philosopher; professor of philosophy 1918-28 in Kiel, then in Munster. Representative of logistics. With Gisbert Hasenjaeger: Grundzuge der mathematischen Logik (Berlin, Gottingen, Heidelberg, 1961).

10. Ernst Hoffmann, 1880-1952; professor of ancient philosophy in Heidelberg.

11. Gerhard Nebel, 1903-1974; student of Heidegger; essayist. Published, inter alia: Griechischer Ursprung, Wuppertal, 1948; Die Not der GOtter (Hamburg, 1957); Orte and Feste (Hamburg, 1962).

24

1. Erich Frank, 1883-1949, philosopher; originally studied history and classical philology, and then turned to philosophy from 1907 in Heidelberg. At first, he came under the influence of Heinrich Rickert and Wilhelm Windelband, under whom he took his degree with a work on Kant, and then came increasingly under the influence of Existenzphilosophie; he habilitated in 1923 under Jaspers with the study Plato and die sogan- nanten Pythagorer. Ein Kapitel aus der Geschichte dergriechischen Geistes, (Halle a.d.S., 1923); Professor Extraordinarius in Heidelberg and, in 1928, Ordinarius in Marburg; in 1939 he emigrated to the United States, where he taught at various universities. On his estimation of Jaspers's philosophy, cf.: Die Philosophie von Jaspers, in Wissen, Wollen, Glauben. Gesammelte Aufsatze zur Philosophiegeschichte and Existenzphilosophie (Zurich and Stuttgart, 1955), pp. 269-88.

2. Julius Ebbinghaus, 1885-1981, philosopher; from 1921 privatdozent and from 1926 professor in Freiburg i. Br.; later professorships in Rostock and Marburg-Ebbinghaus was originally a Hegelian and then later a strict Kantian.

3. Julius Ebbinghaus, Kantinterpretationen and Kantkritik in Deutsche VierteljahrsschriftfiirLiteraturwissenschaft and Geistesgeschichte, vol. 2, no. 1, 1924, pp. 80-115.

4. Marianne Weber, 1870-1954; wife of Max Weber, whose "Lebens-bilde" she wrote during the twenties: Max Weber. Ein Lebensbild (Tubingen, 1926). From 1898, she was active in the women's movement and, in 1919-23, she was the first chairwoman of the Federation of German Women's Organizations; in the course of these activities, she wrote several works, among which "Ehefrau and Mutter in der Rechtsentwicklung. Eine Einfuhrung" (Tubingen, 1907) is the most important. Marianne Weber was a close friend of the Jaspers household.

5. Goethe, Faust I, Prologue in Heaven.

26

1. Fritz Heidegger, 1894-1980; Heidegger's younger brother lived in Megkirch (bank official), transcribed numerous manuscripts, and was himself very interested in philosophy and theology; a witty, humorous personality (see "Ein Geburtstagsbrief des Bruders" in Martin Heidegger-zum 80. Geburtstag von seiner Heimatstadt Mef3kirch, Frankfurt a. M., 1969, pp. 58-63).

2. According to the cabin book, he stayed until October 6 in Todtnauberg.

27

1. Refers to a communication from Jaspers that is not found among Heidegger's papers.

2. Afra Geiger.

28

1. The classical philologists in Marburg: Ernst Maag, Theodor Birt, Ernst Lommatzsch, Paul Friedlander.

29

1. Not among Heidegger's papers, possibly an earlier letter.

2. In the winter semester of 1925-26, Jaspers lectured on "The Philosophy of Religion (including the psychology of religion)."

3. The theme of the lessons for advanced students was Hegel's Logic, part I; the theme of the lessons for beginners was Kant's Critique of Pure Reason.

30

1. Not found in Heidegger's papers.

2. A photograph.

31

1. Not found in Heidegger's papers.

2. The Emergency Society of German Science was founded in 1920 on the initiative of the former Prussian Minister of Culture Friedrich SchmidtOtt and the Nobel Prize winner Fritz Haber for the advancement of the sciences, especially the rising generation of scientists. Members included the five German Academies and all universities represented in the Federation of Schools of Higher Learning. After the second World War, the Research Council and the Emergency Society were fused into the German Research Society, and the Federation and the States cooperated in its financing.

3. Heinrich Maier, 1867-1933; philosopher; professor in Berlin. Representative of critical realism, Aristotle researcher.

4. Wolfgang Windelband, 1886-1945; professor of medieval and modern history; at the time, with the rank of a Ministerial Councillor, he was a personal consultant for the universities in the Prussian Ministry for Science, Art, and Public Education.

32

1. Being and Time appeared in vol. 3 of the Jahrbuch fur Philosophie and phanomenologische Forschung and is dedicated to Edmund Husserl, pp. 1-438. Now in GA 2, with marginalia from the cabin copy, edited by F.-W. v. Herrmann (Frankfurt a. M., 1977, and Tubingen, 16th edition, 1986). Inscribed in the copy given to Husserl is the saying of Lessing: "The greatest clarity was always for me the greatest beauty."

2. Walter F. Otto, 1874-1958; philosopher and classical philologist; Professor in Vienna, Frankfurt a. M., and Tubingen. Among his publications: Die Gotter Griechenlands (Bonn, 1929).

3. Werner Jaeger, 1888-1961; historian of philosophy and classical philologist; Professor in Berlin and at Harvard. Central works: Aristotles, (Berlin, 1923); Paideia-Die Formung des griechischen Menschen (Berlin and Leipzig, 1934-47), 3 vols.

4. Heinrich Rickert lived on Scheffelstrage.

5. Refers to the volume Schellings Philosophic, published by the Deutsche Bibliothek in Berlin.

6. Schelling, Philosophische Untersuchungen fiber das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit.

33

1. Not found in Heidegger's papers.

2. Helene Weig, student of Heidegger's; worked on Aristotle; left Germany during the Nazi period and published her dissertation, Kausalitdt and Zufall in der Philosophic des Aristotles (Basel, 1942). In the foreword, she thanks Heidegger for the opportunity to look into his manuscripts.

3. Paul-Oskar Kristeller, born 1905; student of Heidegger and Jaspers; philosopher; wanted to habilitate under Heidegger, but left Germany in 1933 for Italy (work on Ficino), and in 1939 went to the United States; professor at Columbia University. Emphasis on ancient, renaissance, and early modern philosophy.

4. A hand-written or typed text of the lecture "On the Essence of Truth," delivered in 1926, is not found among Heidegger's papers. Presumably, Heidegger worked out the lecture from his winter semester 1925-26 course "Logic: The Question of Truth" -now in GA 21, ed. Walter Biemel (Frankfurt a. M., 1976), and then later destroyed the notes. The lecture delivered in 1926 should not be confused with the completely reworked lecture by the same title from 1930 (Frankfurt a. M., 1945) and GA 9, Wegmarken, ed. F.-W. v. Herrmann (Frankfurt a. M., 1976).

34

1. Not found in Heidegger's papers.

2. As Kristeller indicates (1988), for financial reasons he was forced to finish his dissertation as soon as possible but, subsequently, returned to Heidegger (1931) who accepted a work on Ficino's Platonism as a habilitation topic. In 1932, he received a stipend from the Emergency Society of German Science to pursue this work.

3. The printing of Being and Time is meant.

4. Carl Heinrich Becker, Prussian Minister of Culture. See note 6 to letter 13.

5. To Silvaplana. See Husserl-Chronik, Denk- and Lebensweg Edmund Husserls, by Karl Schuhmann (The Hague, 1977), p. 308.

35

1. In the summer, Enno E. Jaspers, 1889-1931, the brother of Karl Jaspers, had to be temporarily admitted to the St. Jurgen Asylum for the Mentally and Nervously Ill in Ellen (Bremen).

36

1. Gustav Stirring, 1860-1946; philosopher and psychologist; from 1896 privatdozent in Leipzig, from 1902 to 1911 Ordinarius in Philosophy in Zurich, then in Stra9burg and 1914-27 in Bonn. As an experimental psychologist, Storring was a student of Wilhelm Wundt. He took his studies of thought processes, feelings, and his systematic sketch of normal and pathological psychic life as a point of departure for a realistic epistemology, from whose standpoint he criticized the Southwest German school. His philosophical works stood to the end under the influence of psychological thought.

2. Erich Rothacker, 1888-1965; from 1924 professor of philosophy in Heidelberg, and from 1928 in Bonn. His works essentially concern the logic and system of the human sciences. On his time in Heidelberg, see E. Rothacker, Heitere Erinnerungen (Frankfurt a. M. and Bonn, 1963), pp. 57ff.

3. Max Wentscher, 1862-1942; in 1897 privatdozent in Bonn, in 1904 Professor Extraordinarius in Konigsberg, in 1907 in Bonn, and there Ordinarius in philosophy from 1918; he retired in 1933. His works concerning problems of ethics were influenced by Rudolph Hermann Lotze, among others.

37

1. Carl Heinrich Becker.

38

1. Not found among Heidegger's papers.

2. Hegel, Preface to The Phenomenology of Spirit:

> Quite generally, the familiar, just because it is familiar, is not cognitively understood. The commonest way in which we decive either ourselves or others about understanding is by assuming something is familiar, and accepting it on that account; with all its pros and cons, such knowing never gets anywhere, and it knows not why.
>
> Trans. A.V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 18.

3. R = Rickert

39

1. Not found among Heidegger's papers.

2. Wilhelm Windelband, 1848-1915; philosopher; representative of the Southwest German School of Neokantianism and historian of philosophy. Geschichte der abendlandischen Philosophie im Altertum (Munich, 4th ed 1923); Geschichte der neueren Philosophie (Leipzig 1878-80), 2 vols.; Praludien. Reden and Aufsatze zur Einfiihrung in die Philosophic (Freiburg i. Br. and Tubingen, 1884), 2 vols.

41

1. Jaspers's Philosophy is meant.

2. Hans Driesch, 1867-1941; philosopher; professor in Leipzig. Representative of vitalistic philosophy: Philosophic des Organischen (Leipzig, 1909), 2 vols.

3. Hans Pichler, 1882-1958; philosopher; professor in Greifswald. Critical stance toward Neokantianism; championed a revitalization of ontology.

4. Dietrich Mahnke, 1884-1958; philosopher; professor in Marburg. Leibniz scholar: Unendliche Sphare and Allmittelpunkt-Beitrage zur Genealogie der mathematischen Mystik (Halle, a. d. S., 1937).

5. Erich Becher, 1882-1929; philosopher and psychologist; professor in Munster and Munich. Representative of vitalism: Geisteswissenschaften and Naturwissenschaften (Munich and Leipzig, 1921).

42

1. Grand Duke Friedrich I. von Baden, 1826-1907; was Prince Regent in 1852 and Grand Duke in 1856. Represented a liberal politics and was a champion of national unity under Prussian leadership; was the creator of the Baden election reform of 1904.

2. Kuno Fischer, 1824-1907; habilitated in philosophy in Heidelberg, 1850; from 1856 professor of philosophy in Jena and from 1872 in Heidelberg, where he taught until his death. Fischer was originally a Hegelian, who then in his writings on Kant provided the impetus for a new Kant reception; one of the most significant historians of philosophy of the second half of the nineteenth century, who was famous above all for the brilliant presentation of his historical writings. His main work is the Geschichte der neueren Philosophie in ten volumes.

43

1. Heidegger lectured on The Basic Problems of Phenomenology and held a seminar for advanced students: "Die Ontologie des Aristotles and Hegels Logik" ["The Ontology of Aristotle's and Hegel's Logic"].

2. In the summer semester of 1927, Jaspers held a seminar on Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit.

3. Johan Carl Friedrich Rosenkranz, 1805-1879; philosopher; from 1831 professor in Halle a.d.S. and from 1833 in Konigsberg. One of the most important representatives of the Right-Hegelian school. The requested

volumes: Die Modificationen der Logik, abgeleitet aus dem Begriff des Denkens, Studien Part 3 (Leipzig, 1846), and Wissenschaft der logischen Idee (Konigsberg, 1858-59), 2 vols.

4. Marburg's University jubilee, celebrating its 400th year.

44

1. Jaspers received a paper-bound edition of Being and Time from the publisher, Max Niemeyer.

2. Refers either to a letter from Christmas time, which is no longer extant (cf. Letter 39 from December 26, 1926 from Heidegger to Jaspers), or to Heidegger's visit of January 1, 1927, in Heidelberg. In either case, the discussion must have been about Being and Time, which Jaspers already partially knew about from the printed sheets.

3. Karl Rosenkranz: Erlauterungen zu Hegel's Encyklopadie der philosophischen Wissenschaften, Philosophische Bibliothek, vol. 34 (Berlin, 1870).

4. Johann Eduard Erdmann, 1805-1892; from 1836 professor in Halle a.d.S.; important historian of philosophy (Versuch einer wissenschaftlichen Darstellung der Geschichte der neueren Philosophie, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1834-53); belonged to the Right Hegelians. The reference is to his work GrundrifS' der Logik and Metaphysik. Fur [Vorlesungen (Halle a. d. S., 1841).

5. Kuno Fischer: System der Logik and Metaphysik oder Wissenschaf t-slehre (Heidelberg, 1852).

45

1. The reference is to the obituary, which indicated on May 3 that Johanna Heidegger, nee Kempf, died "after long and painful suffering."

46

1. Cf. Letter 43, note 4.

2. Cf. Letter 32, note 5.

47

1. Gertrud Jaspers took the trip with Marianne Weber.

2. David Meyer, 1834-1929, shopkeeper; lived as a widower in Prenzlau.

3. Dodo Meyer, later Singer, the daughter of Gertrud Jaspers's brother Arthur Meyer.

4. The completion of Philosophy.

5. Cf. Philosophische Autobiographie, pp. 98f:

> The appearance of Heidegger's Being and Time (1927) brought no deepening but, rather, an alienation in our relationship, without my properly noticing it at the time. I reacted without genuine interest, just as I had to his critique of my Psychology of Worldviews years before. Heidegger had read several pages from his manuscript to me already in 1922. It was unintelligible to me. I pressed for a natural way of expression. Heidegger later said, incidentally, that he had come much further, that what was earlier had been surpassed, that it was becoming something. I had no previous knowledge of the contents of the book that appeared in 1927. Now I saw a work that made an immediate immpression with the intensity of its development, its conceptual constructions, and the sure aim of its often illuminating neologisms; but despite the brilliance of its powerful analyses, it seemed to me unfruitful for what I wanted philosophically. I was delighted over the achievement of a man who was connected to me, but I had no desire to read it and soon got stuck because the style, content, and way of thinking did not speak to me. I also did not take

the book to be something that I had to think against, something I had to come to terms with. No impulse came to me from it, in contrast to my conversations with Heidegger.

Heidegger must have been disappointed. I did not do him the service, as the older party, of a thorough reading and critique, since the work of my philosophizing already demanded everything, as he did, as the younger party, working from his own thinking when he critiqued my Psychology of ' Worldviews. Accordingly, it goes without saying that he, for his part, took no real interest in any of my later publications.

6. Seminar.

7. Refers to the organization of Philosophy at that time.

8. The announcement for winter semester 1927-28: "Metaphysics (Its history and contemporary truth)."

48

1. Phenomenological Interpretations of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason.

49

1. On October 19, 1927, Heidegger received the appointment as Ordinarius to the first chair of philosophy in Marburg. The faculty did not allow themselves to be influenced by the initial rejections from the Prussian Ministry of Culture and repeated their nomination.

50

1. Maria Salditt, Hegels Shakespeare-Interpretationen, Berlin, 1927 (in Philosophische Forschung, no. 5, ed. Karl Jaspers).

51

1. Maria Salditt, born 1899; 1920-24 studied philosophy at the Universities of Freiburg i. Br., Wtirzburg, Munich, and Heidelberg, from 1924 to 1926 studied philology and sociology in the United States. She took her degree in 1927 under Jaspers with a dissertation on Hegel's interpretation of Shakespeare. From 1927 to 1929, she taught in the United States. From 1930, she taught at various middle schools in Germany. Maria Salditt was a close confidante of the Jaspers household, especially during the National Socialist period.

2. The Philosophy.

3. Dietrich Mahnke: Dilthey, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 7, in Literarische Berichte aus dem Gebiete der Philosophie. Das umfassende philosophischeLiteraturblattfur Wissenschaft and allgemeines Geistesleben, ed. A. Hoffmann-Erfurt, no. 15/16 (Erfurt, 1928), pp. 34-39. (Jaspers's use of the plural presumably refers to the fact that volume 7 is a collection of various writings that are all discussed by Mahnke.)

4. At the end of his review, Mahnke says that the "hermenutic phenomenology lately developed by Martin Heidegger" confirms the extraordinary contemporaneity and meaning for the future of Dilthey's systematic works "in a surprising way." Through the synthesis of Dilthey and Husserl it will, perhaps, become possible "to fulfill the intention of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit more completely than before, and to give a systematic ontology of true, historically living actuality through the immanent interpretation of psychological and cultural-historical factors ... (p. 38f).

52

1. Ernesto Grassi, born 1902, philosopher of culture; from 1937 professor of philosophy in Freiburg i. Br., from 1938 in Berlin, and from 1948 in Munich, where he was head of the Seminar for Philosophy and Intellectual History of Humanism. The emphases of his historical work were the ancient period and the Renaissance. He was also the editor of several series of scholarly writings.

53

1. The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic.

2. Alfred Weber, 1868-1958; sociologist; Professor in Heidelberg. Cre ator of a sociology of culture: Kulturgeschichte als Kultursoziologie (Leiden, 1935); Prinzipien der Geschichts- and Kultursoziologie (Munich, 1951).

54

1. Kurt Singer, 1885-1962; was at the time a privatdozent in National Economics and Sociology in Hamburg; during the third Reich, he emigrated to Japan and Australia.

2. Kurt Singer, Das Geld als Zeichen, 1920.

3. Georg Friedrich Knapp, 1842-1926; national economist; follower of the newer historical school of national economic doctrine; was a professor in Leipzig (1867-74) and Stra8burg (1874-1919).

4. Wirtschaftsdienst. Kriegswirtschaftliche Mitteilungen uber das Ausland, ed. by the Central Office of the Colonial Institue of Hamburg, 1916-43.

5. Kurt Singer, Platon der Grinder (Munich, 1927).

6. Hans Felix von Eckardt, 1890-1957; from 1927 professor in Heidelberg; dismissed in 1933 and reinstated in 1946 as professor of Sociology.

7. Arthur Salz, 1881-1963; from 1917 professor of national economics, economic history and sociology in Heidelberg; dismissed in 1933, and subsequently emigrated to England.

8. Friedrich Gundolf, 1880-1931; poet and literary scholar; was from 1920 professor of modern German literature in Heidelberg. Close friend of Jaspers.

9. Grundrif' der Sozialoconomik, by S. Altmann, Th. Brinkman, K. Bucher, et. al., (Tubingen, 1914ff).

10. Hans Ritschl, born 1897; finance researcher; was professor in Basel and from 1942 at various universities in Germany.

11. In the protestant theology of the waning nineteenth century, there was talk about so-called "Ritschlianism," a theological direction that came from Albrecht Ritschl, 1822-89, and was also represented by his son Otto, 1860-1944.

12. In the economic sciences, questions about the conditions for the optimal spatial localization of production were designated as "questions of locality."

13. Friedrich Lenz, 1885-1968; national economist; from 1921-33 professor of political economy in GieSen; dismissed in 1933; after an emigration period, professor in Berlin 1946-48.

14. On Kant's Critique of Judgment.

15. Rudolf Virchow, 1821-1902; pathologist; in 1849 was professor in Wurzburg and in 1856 in Berlin; founder of cellular pathology. Important historian of medicine and one of the founders of modern anthropology; as a politician, belonged to the cofounders of the Progressive Party and was a member of the Prussian House of Representatives and the German Reichstag.

56

1. Dr. Jur. Viktor Schwoerer, 1865-1943; senior government official; leader of the higher education department of the Baden Ministry of Instruction.

2. In the letter: "Co. member"

3. Erich Becher, cf. note to Letter 41.

4. Theodor Litt, 1880-1962; philosopher and educator; professor in Leipzig and Bonn. Individuum and Gemeinschaft (Leipzig and Berlin, 1919); Mensch and Welt. Grundlinien einer Philosophie des Geistes (Munich, 1948); Hegel. Versuch einer kritischen Erneuerung (Heidelberg, 1953), inter alia.

5. Bruno v. Freytag-Loringhoff, born 1912; philosopher; professor in Tubingen. Main emphasis on Aristotelian logic: Die ontologischen Grundlagen derMathematik (Halle a. d. S., 1937); Logik. Ihr System and ihr her- hdltnis zur Logistik (Stuttgart, 1955 and 1967), 2 vols.

6. Erich Rothacker, 1888-1965; philosopher and psychologist; professor in Bonn. Emphasis on research in the human sciences: Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften (Tubingen, 1920); Logik and Systematik der Geisteswissenschaften (Munich and Berlin, 1927) (first in: Handbuch der Philosophie, Part 2, ed. A. Baeumler and M. Schroter, Munich 1926); Die Schichten der Personlichkeit (Leipzig, 1938).

7. Adolf Dyroff, 1866-1943; from 1903 to 1934 professor of philosophy and education in Bonn. Representative of a critical realism.

57

1. Cf. letter 36 of October 27, 1926, from Jaspers to Heidegger.

58

1. Schwoerer.

2. Richter.

60

1. The dean was Prof. Dr. Paul Jacobsthal.

2. Bengt Berg, 1885-1967; Swedish writer and ornithologist.

62

1. Oskar Becker, 1889-1964; from 1928 Professor Extraordinarius of philosophy in Freiburg, from 1931 Ordinarius in Bonn. Works mainly on logic and the phenomenology of mathematics.

2. Alfred Baeumler, 1887-1968; philosopher; professor in Dresden and in Berlin. Identified himself with National Socialism: Das Irrationalitat-sproblem in der Asthetik and Logik des 18. Jahrhunderts bis zur Kritik der Urteilskraft (Halle a. d. S., 1923).

3. Julius Stenzel, 1883-1936; philosopher; professor in Kiel. Emphasis on ancient philosophy: Studien zur Entwicklung der platonischen Dialektik von Sokrates zu Aristoteles (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931); Zahl and Gestalt bei Platon and Aristoteles (Leipzig, 1924).

4. The theologians in Marburg: Rudolf Bultmann, Hans von Soden, Friedrich Heiler, Walter Baumgartner, Heinrich Hermelink.

65

1. Not found among Heidegger's papers; was most likely not sent.

2. Max Scheler died on May 19, 1928, in Frankfurt a. M. shortly after being appointed to the University there. Jaspers was supposed to give lectures in his place.

3. Werner Richter was a Germanist at the University of Greifswald in 1921 when Jaspers was offered an appointment there.

4. Hans Jonas, born in 1903; studied with Husserl, Heidegger, Bultmann, and Jaspers. He took his degree in 1928 under Heidegger and Bultmann with a work on the concept of gnosis. He published his subsequent studies on gnosis-Gnosis and spatantiker Geist, 2 vols. (Gottingen, 1934-54) almost right after his emigration, which took him to England in 1933, to Palestine in 1935, to Canada in 1949, and to the United States in 1955, where he taught mainly at the New School for Social Research in New York. In the late

1980s, his book Das Prinzip Verantwortung. Versuch einer Ethik fur die technologische Zivilisation (Frankfurt a. M., 1979) became known around the world.

66

1. Why Jaspers sent this letter "in haste" instead of the longer letter that was already completed can only be surmised. He probably thought his remarks on Scheler were not entirely appropriate.

67

1. Dr. Justus Schwarz, student of Heidegger.

2. Heinz Heimsoeth, 1886-1975; philosopher; professor in Marburg, Konigsberg, and Cologne. Historian of philosophy. Published, inter alia: Die sechs grof.~en Themen der abenlandischen Metaphysik (Berlin, 1922); Transzendentale Dialektik-Ein Kommentar zu Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1966-71); Studien zur Philosophic Immanuel Kants, vol. 1, Metaphysische Ursprunge and Ontologische Grundlagen (Cologne, 1956).

3. Baeumler is no longer on the list of possible candidates.

69

1. The reference is to Heidegger's review of the two volumes of Die Philosophie der symholischen Formen ("Das mythische Denken," Berlin, 1925)-in the Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1928, no. 21, Spalten, 999-1012.

2. In his review, Heidegger elaborates that "an opinion" (1007) about Cassirer's hook would have to "follow upon three points." The third would consist of the "fundamental question of the constitutive function of myth in human Dasein and in the totality of beings in general." Prior to this, there must be an "essential interpretation" (1008) of myth, which must remain "arbitrary and without direction" as long as "it is not grounded in a radical

ontology of Dasein in light of the problem of being in general" (1008). Heidegger then shows, in the terminology of the existentialia of Being and Time, how the "place of the mana-idea" (1009) is to be ontologically determined.

3. What is probably meant is the nonontologizability of Dasein.

4. Philosophische Hefte, 1 (Berlin, 1928) (a special volume on Being and Time).

5. Herbert Marcuse, Beitrage zu einer Phanomenologie des His- torischen Materialismus. In Philosophische Hefte, 1 (Berlin, 1928), pp. 45-68.

6. In the summer semester of 1928, Jaspers conducted a seminar on Hegel's philosophy of history.

7. Being and Time, section 82.

8. Cf. Karl Jaspers, Notizen zu Martin Heidegger, pp. 26f, 266.

9. The setting cannot be determined.

70

1. Jaspers, Philosophy.

2. Heidegger, Being and Time.

3. Henri Bergson, 1859-1941; French philosopher; professor of the College de France. Caused a transformation in French and European philosophy that can be grasped only inadequately by the catchword "Lebensphilosophie." Published inter alia: Essai sur les donne es immediates de la conscience (Paris, 1889); Matiere et memoire. Essai sur la relation du corps a l'esprit (Paris, 1896); Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion (Paris, 1932).

4. The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic.

71

1. Horace Benedict de Saussure, 1740-99, naturalist from Geneva; investigated the geological and geographical conditions of the Alps; in 1787 was the second person to climb Montblanc, which he barometrically determined to be the highest mountain in Europe.

2. Horace B. de Saussure, Voyages dans les Alpes, 4 vols. (1779-96): it looked to me as if I had outlived the world, and now saw its dead body stretched out under my feet."

3. In the summer semester of 1923, Jaspers conducted "Lessons on Kierkegaard."

72

1. Jaspers's offer of appointment to Bonn.

2. Rickert.

3. Rothacker's appointment to Bonn.

4. Not found among Heidegger's papers.

73

1. From the appointment negotiations with the faculty.

2. To the Prussian Ministry for Science, Art, and Public Education, which was responsible for the appointment to Bonn.

3. Presumably the Anglicist Walter Franz Schirmer is meant, who taught at Bonn from 1925 to 1929.

4. Cf. Letter 36 of October 27, 1926, from Jaspers to Heidegger.

5. The list pertaining to the successor of Max Scheler, who died in Frankfurt in May of 1928.

74

1. The Dean of the philosophy faculty was Prof. Paul Jacobsthal.

2. Eberhard Grisebach, 1880-1945; cultural philosopher. Wahrheit and Wirklichkeiten (Halle a. d. S., 1919); Erkenntnis and Glaube (Halle a. d. S., 1923).

3. Paul Tillich, 1886-1965; theologian and philosopher; professor in Marburg, Frankfurt a. M., New York, Harvard, and Chicago. Published inter alia: Mystik and Schuldbewu$tsein in Schellings philosophischer Entwicklung (Giitersloh, 1912); Ober die Idee einer Theologie der Kultur, in Reli- gionsphilosophie der Kultur. Zwei Entwurfe von Gustav Radbruch and Paul Tillich (Berlin, 1919), pp. 29-52. Paul Tillich, Gesammelte Werke, vol. 9, (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 13-31.

4. Max Wertheimer, 1880-1943; psychologist; cofounder of Gestalt psychology; professor in Frankfurt a. M. and from 1933 at the New School for Social Research, New York.

5. On the matter of Scheler's successor.

75

1. The Ministry of Culture and Instruction.

2. Refers to the Ministerial offer in case Jaspers remains in Heidelberg.

3. Wolfgang Windelband, the Ministerial Counselor in the Prussian Ministry for Science, Art, and Public Education.

76

1. The housing allowance was raised to 30 Marks per month. Com bined with this was the ministerial assurance to settle everything with the Protestant Church Congregation of Heidelberg, to whom the House at 66

Plock belonged, so that the lease, which would run out at the end of March 1932, would be extended at least until April 1, 1935.

2. On the margin: "please absolutely confidential."

3. The incease in the basic salary alone came to 40 percent (from 10,000 to 14,000 Marks). With all of the additional increases, Jaspers's monthly salary from April 1, 1929 came to 1,700 Marks.

4. On the margin: "ditto" (meaning: strictly confidential).

77

1. This plan was only carried out in the summer semester of 1929. A manuscript for this lecture series is not among Heidegger's papers.

2. Werner Jaeger, Ober Ursprung and Kreislauf des philosophischen Lebensideals, in Sitzungsberichte der Koniglich-Preuflischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin. Philosophisch-historische Masse (Berlin, 1928), year 1928, vol. 25, pp. 390-421.

78

1. At issue is the successor to Carl Neumann, 1860-1934, who was an Ordinarius in modern art history in Heidelberg from 1911 to 1929.

2. Hans Jantzen, 1881-1967; was an Ordinarius in art history in Freiburg i. Br. from 1916 to 1931, and in Frankfurt from 1931 to 1935, and in Munich from 1935.

3. Not clearly readable; possibly "makes itself attractive."

4. Erwin Panofsky, 1892-1968; was professor of art history in Hamburg from 1926 to 1933; then emigrated to the United States, where he taught from 1935 at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. He was one of the most important Diirer specialists and also published standard works on the history of forms, the theory of art, and iconography.

80

1. Ernst Fabricius, 1857-1942; professor of ancient history at the Univerity of Freiburg i. Br.

2. Heidegger conducted talks on "Kant's Critique of Pure Reason and the Task of a Groundwork for Metaphysics." A memorable discussion with Cassirer ensued.

81

1. In the winter semester of 1928-29, Jaspers conducted a lecture course on "Kant and Kierkegaard."

82

1. Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics (1929) is dedicated to Max Scheler.

2. The second edition of Being and Time.

83

1. Sketch; the fair copy is not among Heidegger's papers.

2. Jaspers read the report, among other things, in the Abendblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung of April 22, 1929, in which the exchange between Cassirer and Heidegger was described as the most impressive event of the three week meeting in Davos.

3. from Wesen des Grundes, in Festschrift, Edmund Husserl zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet (Halle, a. d. S. 1929), pp. 71-100. (Separate printing of the Jahrbuch fur Philosophic and phanomenologische Forschung, supplemental volume.) Provided with the dedication: "With sincere best wishes, Your Martin Heidegger, April 14, 1929."

4. The political philosopher Hannah Arendt (1906-75) studied with Heidegger in Marburg from 1924 to 1925 and, after a semester with Husserl, with Jaspers from 1926. She took her degree under him with a dissertation "The Concept of Love in Augustine: An Attempt at a Philosophical Interpretation," which appeared in 1929 as the ninth and last number of the series "Pbilosopbiscbe Forschungen" ("Philosophical Studies"), edited by Jaspers. She emigated in 1933 to Paris and then to the United States in 1941. In 1946-48, she work as an editor-in-chief, and then as a freelance writer. She was then from 1963 a professor of political theory at the University of Chicago, and from 1968 at the New School for Social Research in New York. Her main work, The Origins of Totalitarianism, appeared in 1951.

5. Cf. letter 10 (of August 4, 1929) from Jaspers to Hannah Arendt in: Hannah Arendt-Karl Jaspers Correspondence, 1926-69, ed. Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner, trans. Robert and Rita Kimber, (New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1992), pp. 8-9.

6. On the Emergency Society, see letter 31 from February 17, 1926, note 2.

7. In 1929, Hannah Arendt began her work on the "Biography" of the "German Jewess" Rahel Varnhagen (1771-1833), which only appeared after the second World War, first in English translation and then in German in 1959.

84

1. The announcement of the lecture course for summer semester 1929: "German Idealism (Fichte, Hegel, Schelling) and the Philosophical Problematic of the Present Age."

85

1. Edmund Husserl zum siebsigsten Geburtstag, in Akademischen Mitteilungen. Organ fur die gesamten Interessen der Stundentenschaft an der

Albert-Ludwigs-Universitat in Freiburg i. Br., 4th issue, 9th semester, no. 3, May 14, 1929, pp. 46ff.

2. Eugen Herrigel, 1885-1955; from 1924 to 1929 professor at Tohoku University in Sendai, Japan, from 1929 Ordinarius in Erlangen. Herrigel was a student of H. Rickert, and thus the warning from Jaspers.

3. In the middle of June 1929, the Rector of the University of Heidelberg, the jurist Karl Heinsheimer, died. According to the protocol of the meeting of July 6, 1929 (Heidelberg University Archive, B-1261/1,2) the new Rector, the physician Emil Gotschlich, was already chosen on the first ballot with 53 of 55 votes. The election mentioned by Jaspers will not, then, be in reference to him. At the same meeting, an Ordinarius in the Great Senate was appointed to the Select Senate. Here, there was an election contest between the candidates Alfred Weber, Karl Meister (1880-1963, classical philologist), and Willy Andreas (1884-1967, modern history). On the final ballot, Karl Meister unexpectedly prevailed against Alfred Weber. Jaspers is probably referring to this election.

86

1. Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics, provided with the dedication: "With sincere best wishes. Martin Heidegger."

2. The "impertinent questions" about the Husserl talk (cf. Letter 85 of July 7, 1929, note 1) can only be surmised: Heidegger, who in his letters speaks from time to time very skeptically and even disrespectfully about Husserl, gave, on his seventieth birthday on April 8, 1929, a downright hymnical address on Husserl's "leadership" and his "philosophical existence." Husserl's research had "above all created an entirely new space for philosophical questioning, with new demands and transformed assessments, with a new vision for the hidden powers of the great tradition of Western philosophy" (p. 46). This new philosophy of Husserl's is "not a mere schema of world-orientation, not at all a means and work of human Dasein, but this itself, as far as it freely occurs out of its ground" (p. 47). It is open "for a dialogue with the effective powers of Dasein as a whole" (p. 47),

and that is "the attitude of the philosopher: listening into the preparatory song that is perceptible in all essential occurrences of the world" (p. 47). At this time Jaspers must have found these judgments about Husserl to be downright grotesque. To him, Husserl was the archetype for philosophy's inversion into science, a man who also made "the gestures of seeing" but mostly only saw trivialities (cf. Recbenschaft and Ausblick, Munich, 1958, p. 386). In addition, he had to have taken Heidegger's reference to the "schema of world-orientation" as an indirect critique aimed at him. Finally, he could certainly have asked the question as to what "leadership" in philosophy is supposed to be in the first place.

87

1. Probably refers to a letter or a card from Jaspers to Heidegger. Not found among his papers. Heidegger's recommendation was for Hannah Arendt.

88

1. Kurt Riezler, 1882-1955; philosopher and diplomat; professor at Frankfurt a. M. and New York. Publications on political theory, philosophy of history, and aesthetics.

2. Maria Scheler, the third wife, who oversaw the literary remains and was until her death in 1969 the sole editor of Scheler's writings.

89

1. Below this, in Heidegger's hand. "Gartenstr. 28" (the address of Jaspers's parents' house).

2. Carl Wilhelm Jaspers (1850-1940) and Henriette Jaspers, nee Tantzen (1862-1941).

90

1. "What is Metaphysics?" (1929).

95

1. Jaspers obviously left this letter in the room after Heidegger's lecture.

96

1. On March 28, 1930, Heidegger received an offer of appointment to Berlin.

97

1. In Jaspers's papers, a copy by Gertrud Jaspers with an insignificant alteration.

102

1. Jaspers is already speculating about Rickert's successor.

2. The Ministry of Culture and Instruction.

3. Ernst Buschor, 1886-1961, classical archeologist; declined to succeed Ludwig Curtius in Heidelberg.

4. Erwin Panofsky declined the appointment to Heidelberg (as successor to Carl Neumann).

5. The Center, named for the seats in the middle of the parliament, was the party of political Catholicism. During the Weimar Republic it was the leading party in the government.

103

1. Hans Rheinfelder, 1898-1971; Romanist who habilitated in Freiburg i. Br. and in 1933 was an Ordinarius in Munich.

2. Heinrich Bessler, 1900-69; musicologist; from 1928 professor in Heidelberg, later in Jena and Leipzig.

3. Leonardo Olschki, 1885-1961; Romanist, student of Karl Vossler; taught from 1918 to 1932 at the University of Heidelberg and then as a guest lecturer at the Royal University in Rome. In 1933 he was forced into retirement from the University of Heidelberg on racial grounds; he continued to hold lectures in Rome until that was also prohibited; in 1938 he emigrated to the United States, where he was unemployed for a long time; in 1944 he received a teaching appointment in the Department for Oriental Languages at Berkeley, which was retracted in 1950 during the McCarthy purges although, in the meantime, he had become an American citizen. From 1954 he taught in Rome and Venice. His earlier main work was the three-volume Geschichte der neusprachlichen wissenschaftlichen Literatur (Heidelberg, 1919-1927).

106

1. Gochi Myake, 1895-1982; philosopher; professor at Tohoku University in Sendai, the University of Kyoto and Gaskushu University in Tokyo; from 1930 to 1932 studied in Germany. Several publications on Heidegger's philosophy, moral philosophy, the philosophy of art, and the problem of time.

2. An East Friesian island which Jaspers visited often during his childhood.

107

1. Dr. Werner Brock was Heidegger's assistant from 1931 to 1933 and then emigrated to England (Cambridge) with Heidegger's support.

2. Heinrich Rickert, Die Heidelberger Tradition in der deutschen Philosophic (Tubingen, 1931).

108

1. In the typescript: "succession piece" (Nachfolgeschrift); in the draft: "successorship" (Nachfolgeschaft). Presumably: Rickert included Hermann Glockner, August Faust, and Eugen Herrigel in the Heidelberg tradition but didn't even mention Jaspers.

2. The 1,000th little Goschen volume, Die geistige Situation der Zeit [Man in the Modern Age] is meant, which appeared shortly before the three-volume Philosophy.

109

1. The large work, the three-volume Philosophy (1932). The small forerunner: Man in the Modern Age.

2. The success of Being and Time.

110

1. Letter 102 of May 24, 1930.

2. Cf. letter 101 of May 17, 1930; Heidegger evidently visited Jaspers during Whitsun week of 1930.

3. Dolf Sternberger, 1907-89; studied with Jaspers (1927) and with Heidegger (1929) and took his degree in 1932 under Paul Tillich in Frankfurt a. M. with an "Investigation of Martin Heidegger's Existential Ontology" (Der Verstandene Tod, Leipzig, 1934). He had already published a critique of Heidegger's book Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics in the Frankfurter Zeitung (September, 1929). The circumstances of Heidegger's remarks on Sternberger are unclear.

4. Cf. letter 86 of July 24, 1929.

5. It concerns Jaspers's opinion as to "... whether a hierarchy in intellectual life can be felt again" in the Frankfurter Zeitung of December 14, 1931, in reference to the article by Paul Tillich, "Is There Still a University?" which appeared in the same paper on November 22, 1931.

111

1. Karl Jaspers, Max Weber. Deutsches Wesen im politischen Denken, im Forschen and Philosophieren, (Oldenburg i. 0., 1932).

2. Max Weber.

3. Max Weber.

114

1. Ernst Krieck, 1882-1947; educationist; after professorships in Dortmund and Frankfurt a. M., was an Ordinarius in Heidelberg, where from April 1, 1937, was named Rector by the Reichs Ministry of Education. Jaspers's dismissal came during his rectorship. Krieck was a leading participant in the nazification [Gleichschaltungl of the German universities. Next to Alfred Baeumler, he was the most influential educator among the National Socialists and had a strong effect upon National Socialist political philosophy. Heidegger's skeptical estimation of Krieck, already in March of 1933, turned into an openly and mutually hostile relationship after a fundamental conceptual disagreement over Krieck's Cultural-Political Union of German University Teachers, founded in Frankfurt a. M., and as a consequence of Krieck's vigorous attack on Heidegger in his journal Volk im Werden (1934). Krieck wrote that Heidegger's philosophy is "a ferment of disintegration and dissolution for the German people," that Heidegger belonged to those who are "secretly working for the destruction of the National Socialist renewal movement," that the sources of his thinking "were not always Germanic," that his thinking reflects "the foreign thinking of the Jew," and that he shows himself to be "foreign and hostile to life" in the eyes of the creative German man. (See Volk im Werden, no. 2 [1934] and no. 3 [19351.)

2. Wofgang Schadewaldt, 1900-74; ancient philologist; professor in Konigsberg in 1928, Freiburg i. Br. in 1929, Leipzig in 1934, Berlin in 1941, and Tubingen in 1950. Friend of Heidegger. Translator of Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Plato.

3. Joseph Sauer, 1872-1949; papal House Prelate; professor of Christian Archeology and Art History, Rector of Freiburg University in 1932-33.

4. See Heidegger's Rectoral Address, "The Self-Determination of the German University." Heidegger was elected Rector of the University of Freiburg on April 4, 1933.

115

1. On this, cf. Philosophische Autobiographic, p. 100:

> "At the end of March 1933, Heidegger came for the last time to us for a long visit. Despite the fact that National Socialism won many victories in the March elections, we spoke together as before. He bought me a record of Gregorian church music, which we listened to. Heidegger departed sooner than planned. In view of the quickly developing National Socialist reality, he said, "one must join in" [`Man muff sick einschalten']. I was surprised but didn't ask."

2. Jaspers's Jewish brother-in-law, Ernst Meyer (1883-1952), conducted a medical practice in Berlin-Sudende. The "Aryan paragraph" of the law of April 7, 1933, pertaining to the restitution of public officials, had already led to a partial boycott of his practice by "Aryan" patients. In his obituary notice for him (Artzliche Mitteilungen, no. 24, December 20, 1952), Jaspers reported that already in 1933 Ernst Meyer had said to him: "They will put us in barracks camps and eventually set them on fire." At the time, Jaspers took this to be the product of an over-excited imagination. Ernst Meyer emigrated in 1928 to Holland, where, in hiding during the occupation, he wrote his Dialektik des Nichtwissens, (in Studia Philo- sophica, Supplement 5, Basel, 1950).

117

1. At the invitation of the Heidelberg student body, Heidegger gave a talk at the university on "The University in the New Reich." See the HeidelbergerNeuesten Nachrichten, no. 150 from July 1, 1933, p. 4. The article

is published in: Guido Schneeberger, Nachlese zu Heidegger. Dokumente zu seinem Leben and Denken (Bern, 1962), pp. 73ff.

2. More than 20 years later, Jaspers described this last visit as follows:

> In May he paid us a short visit for the last time, on the occasion of a lecture which he gave before the students and professors of Heidelberg, now as Rector of the University of Freiburg. He was greeted as comrade Heidegger by the chairman of the Heidelberg student body. It was a masterful speech in form, but in content it was a program for the National Socialist renewal of the university ... He was thanked with enormous applause from the students and some fewer professors. I sat motionless in the front row with my legs stretched straight out, my hands in my pockets.

After that, for my part, our talks were no longer candid. I told him that people had expected him to put himself into action on behalf of our university and its great tradition. No answer. I talked about the jewish question, about the vicious nonsense of the Elders of Zion. To this he replied: "But there is a dangerous international Jewish conspiracy." At table, he said with a rather furious tone that the fact that there were so many philosophy professors was a nuisance and that we should keep only two or three in all of Germany. "Which ones, then?" I asked. No answer. "How is such an uncultivated man like Hitler supposed to govern Germany?" "Cultivation has nothing to do with it," he replied, "just look at his marvellous hands!"

Heidegger seemed to have changed. At his arrival there was already a distancing mood. National Socialism had become an intoxication of the people. To greet him, I sought Heidegger out in his room above. "It's just like 1914 ..." I began, and wanted to add, "once again this deceptive intoxication of the masses." But in face of Heidegger's beaming approval of my first words, the rest of the sentence stuck in my throat. This radical break disconcerted me extraordinarily. I had not experienced anything like this with any other human being. It was all the more provoking, because Heidegger seemed not to have taken any notice. But he certainly attested to it in never visiting us again after 1933, and he said nothing when I was

removed from my position in 1937, but I still heard in 1935 that he had spoken of his "friend Jaspers" in a lecture. I doubt that he has comprehended this break even today.

I was at a loss. Heidegger had not said anything to me about his inclinations toward National Socialism before 1933. For my part, I should have talked to him about it. His visits had become less frequent in the last years before 1933. Now it was too late. I fell short in face of Heidegger himself being in the grip of intoxication. I did not tell him that he was on a false path. I no longer trusted his changed being. I myself felt the threat in respect to the violence that Heidegger now participated in, and thought, as I have many times in my life, of Spinoza's caution.

Had I gone wrong due to all of the positive things that had been between us? Was I myself guilty because I did not seek out a radical coming to terms with him, based upon these positive things? Did I contribute to this prior to 1933 by being guilty of not seeing the dangers in time, of taking all of National Socialism to be too harmless, although in 1932 Hannah Arendt told me clearly enough where it was going?

> In May 1933 [sic!, cf. note 11, Heidegger departed for the last time. We never saw each other again." (Philosophische Autobiographie, pp. 100ff.)

119

1. Martin Heidegger, "The Self-Determination of the German University." Held on the official assumption of the rectorship of the University of Freiburg i. Br. on May 27, 1933. Provided with the handwritten dedication: "With sincere best wishes. Heidegger."

2. In respect to the Rectoral Address and to Heidegger's talk in Heidelberg, Jaspers wrote almost thirty years later (cf. Karl Jaspers, Notizen zu Martin Heidegger, no. 65):

> ... I still tried to interpret his Rectoral Address in the best lightbut at the same time, I no longer trusted him. I did not express this, but held to the principle: by expecting the best, the other will meet this

> expectation, inasmuch as we have good relations of long standing, while an expression of mistrust would destroy everything ... The spiritual quality was not lost, although the content of his talk and his actions had sunk to a level that was unbearably low and foreign.
>
> In spite of this, I could not stop taking him seriously, but now as a substantial opponent, as the medium of a power that was threatening and dangerous, and ruinous for what was intelligible to me.
>
> By standards that are certainly subjective, his speech, his actions, and his comportment seemed so ignoble that there was a substantial estrangement between us in contrast to the fluidity of philosophizing. Even in this there was an estrangement, and yet there was a connection in that we were both struck by what philosophy actually appeared to be, and we believed ourselves to be in agreement about this at the time (without any specific content).

3. Not found among Heidegger's papers-it must concern a proposal from Gustav Adolf Scheel, b. 1907. A medical student, Scheel was elected president of the Heidelberg student body in 1931 by the National Socialist majority. He played a leading role in cleansing Jews, Marxists, and pacifists from the Heidelberg student body. In 1936, he was a Reichsstudentenfuhrer. At the same time, he was an Inspector in the Security Police and the Security Service in Stuttgart. In 1941, he was a Reichsstatthalter and District Leader in Salzburg and, near the end of the war, he was designated to be Reichsminister for Science, Art, and Public Education. In the course of denazification, he was sentenced to several years of hard labor. Later, he became a practicing physician.

In 1932, Jaspers was a committee member for a disciplinary hearing against Scheel and his consorts. Jaspers later reported that, through his deceitfulness, Scheel managed to get off. For his part, during the investigations after the war, Scheel supposedly maintained that, during the National Socialist era, he had interceded several times on behalf of Jaspers and his wife.

4. The script "Theses on the Question of the Renewal of Institutions of Higher Learning" ("Thesen zur Frage der Hochschulenerneuerung") is found among Jaspers's papers as "typescript 27 mF." On the title page is the note: "Written in July, 1933." Then there is a later addition: "several things cut out for the address on the University in 1945"-this refers to the address "Renewal of the University," which Jaspers gave on August 15, 1945, on the occasion of the reopening of medical courses at the University of Heidelberg.

Included in the "Theses" is a page, presumably the outline of a letter to the Ministery of Culture and Instruction in Karlsruhe, which refers to several pieces of background information:

"To convey thoughts that could be taken as private to the deciding governmental authority, without being asked, always carries misgivings. That I risk doing this comes from being aware that the moment is decisive for the future of the German University. Whoever means to say something from his own experience about the spiritual possibilities of the University may, in such a moment, certainly request a hearing without importunity; he makes no demands, but shows what is perhaps already recognized in a decisive place, and also perhaps prompts awareness on a few points.

These notes were made in July for a society of Heidelberg Dozents, who were supposed to develop in discussion what they considered it essential to do for the new universities. The society dissolved on personal grounds before it began its work.

I did not aim for perfecton by any means, but I imparted, from the idea of the whole, fragments of what seemed essential to me at the time, because it did not emerge in the discussions and plans that were made public without authorization. It does not conflict with the principles that I have heard thus far from the side of the government, but stands at one with them, and need not stand in opposition to the government's plans that are unknown to me.

Because I consider it counterproductive at present to develop and publish these theses in a pamphlet, I am sending them confidentially to the authority that will be decisive for our institutions."

On the page is noted:

Not sent:

1. Heidegger has been informed-in a letter from me-and can, if he wishes, refer the authorities to it

2. 1 can do nothing without being asked, since it will be said to me that, as a person not belonging to the party and as the spouse of a Jewish woman, I am only tolerated and cannot be trusted."

From this, it must be concluded that after Jaspers hesitated to send his "Theses" without a preceding request, he secretly hoped for a time that Heidegger could prompt such a request from the Ministry of Culture and Instruction. That he also did not show the "Theses" to Heidegger is presumably because he was uncertain as to how they might be received, given the political situation.

In the "Theses," Jaspers's position in the nazification of the University that was quickly gathering around him can be read more immediately than in all of the later, retrospective self-interpretations:

The "Theses" proceed from the problem that, in terms of its greatest period, from 1770 to 1830, the German University has gradually declined for 100 years and, in our century, the decline has accelerated.

Manifest injuries are named: the break-up of knowledge, which is becoming ever more meaningless, into an almost arbitrary multiplicity of things not worth knowing; the increasing training in a business that is scattered and scattering; the administrative overgrowth of committees and offices; the general level that is sinking to a shallow averageness; and the increasing misuse of freedom because "the correlate that belongs to freedom is missing: the exclusion of those who fail." A renewal of the University is, therefore, urgently needed. It cannot consist of a restoration of the institution of the university of 1770-1830 but must venture the attempt to allow the University to come alive under new conditions and in a new form. In addition, there is "in the present situation a never recurring possibility and

danger: the possibility of overcoming all delaying and diluting procedures of commissions and offices through the decisive direction of a man with unlimited authority over the universities, a man who can rely on the powerful impetus of a youth that is conscious of the situation and the exceptional readiness of those who are otherwise half-hearted and indifferent; however the danger is that these impulses become confused ... and that the decision of the ruling authorities will not be up to the spiritual task. The possibility of a genuine renewal of German science is at the same time the danger of its ultimate death." Because this danger is a threat, Jaspers states that leading researchers and teachers have a duty "to bring their thoughts on reform to the ears of the decidng authorities." In 1933, Jaspers must therefore still have been of the opinion that, with the new regime, a rational renewal of the University could be carried out under certain conditions, insofar as it ordered what leading scholars prompt it to do, but, if the regime doesn't listen, the final downfall of the University is imminent.

As substantial reforms, Jaspers recommends that fewer lecture courses and lessons should be offered. To this end, "individual homework" should "take on a broader scope." A university education should be in principle a venture from and into freedom. "For this it is necessary to eliminate all study plans as binding requirements for the division and days of a course of study, the elimination of certificates and formal documents." Professorial chairs should only be given to "creative personalities of scientific distinction," otherwise, even in important subjects, Extraordinariats or temporary teaching contracts are sufficient. This arrangement would have the advantage of making the faculties smaller once again. The selection of those who will occupy professorial chairs will, in the last instance, fall to a curator appointed for life at each university, and therefore not to a central authority for all universities. The "administration of the university is to be made simple," "as many committees, controls, authorities, and meetings as possible are to be eliminated, and decisions for which there is personal responsiblity are to be increased: the freedom of Rectors and Deans is to be strengthened vis-a-vis the senate and the faculty." They will act openly but "without depending on decisions of the majority, except on certain vital questions." Jaspers thus seems to agree with the Fiihrer principle within the university. However, he stipulates a most considerable reservation: Whoever

decides as an individual must be "put under internal pressure," so that freedom is not misused. "After a time to be determined, whoever was in the deciding position must justify himself," apparently before the members of the university. "Ruthless criticism" must then be allowed, indeed, "there must be a disinterested authority who can impose censure on the basis of true insight into the motives of the one being questioned." Only when there is the risk that the one who leads can be made answer able is there also the hope "that for leading offices, men who are certain of their ability will be ready ..."

As for what concerns work service and military training, these are "not parts of the university, but the experience of an overlapping reality" that binds "the university to the foundations of existence and to the people as a whole." They produce a discipline and a consciousness of a special kind, which "is not to be copied or repeated, but completed in scientific education." In addition, for "physical reasons," a temporary separation from study time is necessary. "If it is to be fruitful, a semester must be devoted entirely either to studying-in connection with limited training-or to military service."

Finally, in manifold ways, the primacy of politics over science will be forced back: "No authority in the world" can set the goals for research and teaching "other than the elicited brilliance of true knowing itself." Academic freedom does not bind itself by politics, and not by external force, and not by authority, but only by the Socratic relationship of those who teach and learn together. The reform of the university cannot consist in "putting into effect a few innovations that correspond to the flow of time." Within the university, the opponent is not the one who thinks differently politically, but ignorance, routine, and spiritlessness. "It would be an illusion to believe that today at the university, where it is a matter of intellectual accomplishment, something is still to be gained by political struggle ... Only an intellectual struggle can effect something in the intellectual domain." "The original search for truth" has its place in the university.

The "Theses" were a vote for a platonic-elitist aristocracy in the university, combined with Weberian ideas about ethical responsibility, and

the accountability of all those who have power. They aimed at an almost unlimited freedom to teach and to learn, a freedom in which the quality of teachers and reseachers should take effect with the least possible interference, and the personality of the students should best develop. Their illusion lies in the still present belief that the political leadership also wants this freedom or could find its way back to it. The illusion was, neverthless, so great that Jaspers agreed with the new Baden university constitution, while other ranking scholars recognized in it the end of the university. There is no question that he had no idea about whom he was dealing with. The "Theses" are published in the Jarhbuch der Osterreichischen Karl Jaspers-Gesellschaft, ed. Elisabeth Salamun-Hybasek and Kurt Salamun, Issue 2, 1989, pp. 5-27.

5. On August 21, 1933, the Minister of Culture, instruction, and justice for the Land of Baden proclaimed a new temporary University Constitution, the complete text of which was published the next day in the Baden newspaper (also in the Heidelberger Neuesten Nachrichten, p. 2, and in the Heidelberger Tageblatt, p. 1).

6. The "extraordinary step" consisted in radically assimilating university structures to the Fi hrer principle and in subordinating the university to political supremacy. Both were unified in the so-called "Gleichschaltung":

> The Rector should be " Ftihrer of the university"; "all powers of the current senate (select and great)" would be transferred to him. He would no longer be elected, but appointed by the Minister "from the number of Professors Ordinarius"; his term of office was not limited; its end "will be determined by the Ministry." The Rector "could name as his representative a `Chancellor' from among the professoriat and could name further representatives for specific purposes." The Rector "could call together the Deans, or otherwise the professoriat, with or without the Assistants, at any time to deal with the ... general scientific and educational tasks of the university."
>
> The senate would only still be allowed to advise the Rector. Its members were the Rector, the Chancellor, the five (since June 1934, six) Deans, and "five more senators named by the Rector," of which

two had to be Professors Ordinarius and three of non- Ordinarius rank. The Rector was authorized to appoint three additional Dozents [Lecturers] to the senate. The Rector then had to determine the term of office. The leader of the student body and an additional student, and also a representative of the Assistants or the civil service, were to be brought into the proceedings of the senate when it discussed matters concerning one of these three groups. Moreover, the Rector was free to call in members of all groups belonging to the university when he considered it appropriate to do so.

The Deans of the faculty were appointed by the Rector, as well as their representatives; both must be Professors Ordinarius. Setting the term of office was a matter for the Rector. Just as with the Rector in his domain, the Dean also had "sole authority to decide in all matters pertaining to the faculty." Faculty members could "be called in for consultation"; on important matters (e.g., appointments and honorary promotions), this must occur. The Dean was "answerable to the Rector alone," who was authorized to participate in faculty meetings or to send a representative.

This set of regulations went into effect in Baden, as the first region, on October 1, 1933.

(Sources: Die Verfassung der badischen Universitdten and der Techn. Hochschule in Karlsruhe [The Constitution of the Baden Universities and Technical School in Karlsruhe], Decree no. 2296. Hermann Weisert, Badische Hochschulverfassung [The Baden University Constitution] of August 21, 1933, in Die Verfassung der Universitdt Heidelberg [The Constitution of the University of Heidelberg] (Heidelberg, 1974), p. 127).

7. Jaspers is referring to Article 111.1. of the new constitution: "Sole decision-making authority belongs to the Dean (Department Chair) on all matters pertaining to the faculty (department). Other members of the faculty (department) can be brought in for consultation. On important matters, their opinion is to be obtained in written form. Faculty (department) decisions will not be considered."

120

1. Karl Jaspers, Reason and Existenz.

2. Heidegger's lecture course, summer semester 1935: Introduction to Metaphysics.

121

1. Handwritten note, inserted into the Nietzsche book. Jaspers wrote in the book: "With sincere greetings! May 14, 1936 Jaspers."

122

1. "Holderlin and das Wesen der Dichtung" ["Holderlin and the Essence of Poetry"] in Das innere Reich 3, 1936, pp. 1065-78 (Special edition, Munich, 1927). Now in Elucidations of Holderlin's Poetry.

2. Karl Jaspers, Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of His Philosophical Activity.

3. Heidegger did, however, conduct a Nietzsche lecture course in the winter semester of 1936-37: "The Will to Power as Art." Published in Nietzsche.

In following years, Heidegger worked on a Nietzsche interpretation. See the lecture course from summer semester 1937: "The Eternal Return of the Same" in Nietzsche, the lecture course from summer semester 1939: "The Will to Power as Knowledge" in Nietzsche, Lecture Course II from the trimester of 1940: "European Nihilism" in Nietzsche.

4. The enclosed pamphlet: "Mein Leben. Autohiographische Skizze des jungen Nietzsche" l"My Life: An Autobiographical Sketch by the Young Nietzsche"], (Frankfurt a. M., 1936). The dedication: "With sincere greetings. Your Martin Heidegger, May, 1926."

5. The Schelling lecture course appeared under the title "Schelling's Treatise on the Essence of Human Freedom (1809)" now in Schelling's Treatise on the Essence of Human Freedom.

6. Heidegger told his son Hermann after the war that he never received a reply to this letter from May 16, 1936. For that reason, he no longer wrote to Jaspers but only sent him his publications. Jaspers's outline for a reply, strangely enough, carries the same date: May 16, 1936.

123

1. The letter is only extant as an outline in Jaspers's papers, but without the note "not sent."

2. In the outline, there follows a stricken passage: "But to say a little about myself: Physically, I am living on the edge; the smallest demandeven travelling-upsets my body. At the moment, I am in good condition. Last year, from July until October and in later weeks until Christmas, I was very ill, had chills and hemmorrhages-but everything came around again. The kind of work I am doing on Nietzsche can he continued even in bed, so the vacation was not lost."

3. In the summer semester of 1936, Jaspers conducted the seminar "Lessons on Nietzsche."

124

1. Found as an outline among Jaspers's papers, provided with the note: "not sent."

2. On October 9, Heidegger sent Jaspers his essay "Plato's Doctrine of Truth." See Martin Heidegger, "Plato's Doctrine of Truth," in Pathmarks, pp. 155-82. It was provided with the dedication: "With sincere best wishes. M. Heidegger. October 9, 1942."

3. Martin Heidegger, "As When on a Holiday" (1941). Provided with the dedication: "With sincere best wishes. Yours, Martin Heidegger."

4. This must refer to Letter 123 of May 16, 1936 from Heidegger. An additional "friendly confirmation of receipt" is not extant among Jaspers's papers. Heidegger formulated the considerable objections he had at the time to Jaspers's Nietzsche interpretation already in the winter semester of 1936-37 in his lecture course "Nietzsche: The Will to Power as Art." See Martin Heidegger, Nietzsche, Volume I: The Will to Power as Art, p. 23:

> ... True, Jaspers discusses Nietzsche's teaching in greater detail and discerns that here we are in the presence of one of Nietzsche's decisive thoughts. In spite of the talk about Being, however, Jaspers does not bring the thought into the realm of the grounding question of Western philosophy and, thereby, also into actual connection with the doctrine of the will to power.
>
> The reason for this not-immediately-transparent standpoint is that, for Jaspers, to put it most sharply, a philosophy is not possible in the first place. At bottom, it is an "illusion" for the purposes of morally illuminating the human personality. An actual, or the actual, truth-power of essential knowledge is lacking in philosophical concepts. Because Jaspers most fundamentally no longer takes philosophical knowledge seriously, there is no actual questioning any more. Philosophy becomes a moralizng psychology of human existence. That is a standpoint that, despite all displays, remains barred from ever penetrating into Nietzsche's philosophy in a way that comes to terms with it through questioning.

In the lecture course of 1940: "Nietzsche: European Nihilism," he develops his critique (GA II, vol. 48, p. 28):

> The Basic Deficiencies of K. Jaspers 's Nietzsche Book:
>
> 1. that he writes such a book in the first place;

2. that he overlooks every historical stage of Nietzsche's work (not mere historical development) and indiscriminately scours passages from the writings of the early period and pieces them together with passages from the later writings;

3. that he "relativizes" decisive insights of Nietzsche's, which are not private opinions but necessities of Western metaphysics, and asserts that Nietzsche himself had taken them to be only conditionally correct, presumably as ciphers;

4. that he opposes all of this with an existential subjectivism that has a theological, Christian tinge, and thus neither prepares a decision nor recognizes which decision Nietzsche himself is in the history of the truth of being.

5. At the end of the summer semester of 1937, Jaspers was put into retirement because his wife was a Jew, in accordance with the law on the reestablishment of the civil service "for simplifying the administration" (paragraph 6). The retirement was a de facto prohibition from teaching.

6. Karl Jaspers, Descartes and Philosophy. Dedication: "With sincere best wishes! July 25, 1937 Jaspers." Karl Jaspers, Philosophy of Existence. Dedication: "With sincere best wishes! K. Jaspers."

7. There follows a stricken passage: "What I otherwise heard about you was indirect, sparse, and insignificant, so it disappeared quickly from my memory, except for a few letters from you to other people, who then came to me with them in 1933 and 1934 because they were at a loss. I have nothing to say about this because of the discretion they required."

8. There follows a stricken passage: "And the basic fact of our current situation with one another (now it is almost better not to mention it) cannot be changed."

9. Cf. Martin Heidegger, "Plato's Doctrine of Truth," in Pathmarks, p. 155: "But the `doctrine' of a thinker is that which, within what is said,

remains unsaid, that to which we are exposed so that we might squander ourselves on it." [Translation altered]

10. Ibid.: "In order to experience and to prospectively know what a thinker left unsaid, whatever that might be, we have to consider what he said." [Translation altered]

11. Ibid.: "What remains unsaid in Plato's thinking is a turn in the attunement in the essence of truth." [Translation altered]

12. Ibid. p. 182:

> What is first required is an appreciation of the "positive" in the "privative" essence of aletheia. The positive must first be experienced as the fundamental trait of being itself. First of all, what must break in upon us is that exigency whereby we are compelled to question not just beings in their being but, first of all, being itself (that is, the difference). Because this exigency stands before us, the original essence of truth still lies in its hidden origin.

Jaspers added to this in the margin: "This has to be carried out. As it stands, it is unintelligible."

As a general critique of Heidegger's interpretation of the allegory of the cave, Jaspers noted in his author's copy: "H. treats Plato like a man with `doctrines'-just like Zeller-a completely unplatonic frame of mind. No dialectic-no movement in actual participation-some kind of phantasma-nihil-takes the place of Existenz-Transzendenz-Plato falsely characterized. Rather laughable assertions of totality!"

13. Hans von Soden, 1881-1945, theologian; was from 1924 an Ordinarius in New Testament and Church History in Marburg. On the different concepts of truth, see his essay "Was ist Wahrheit?" ["What is Truth"], Marburger Akademische Reden 46 (Marburg, 1927).

1. Written on the page: "Not sent." Appended to this is an additional page from October 30, 1966:

I no longer know why I didn't send this letter from March 1, 1948.

I can only surmise:

Because the thought that Heidegger never publicly accounted for his political behavior or recanted, it kept coming to mind. Making this public was necessary because Heidegger acted publicly in 1933 with addresses and publications.

That he simply dodged the issue after 1945 was objectively and humanly intolerable."

2. In March of 1948, Jaspers resettled in Basel after taking the appointment to succeed Paul Haberlin for the summer semester of 1948.

3. Even after the last letter of May 16, 1936, Heidegger sent almost all of his publications to Jaspers and always provided them with a dedication.

4. See Appendix.

5. See Appendix.

6. On this matter, see the Foreword by Hans Saner in Karl Jaspers, Notizen zu Martin Heidegger, ed. Hans Saner (Munich/Zurich, 1978), pp. 14f, and Hugo Ott, Martin Heidegger als Rektor der Universitat Freiburg i. Br. 1933-34. IT Die Zeit des Rektorats von Martin Heidegger, . . . in the Zeitschrift des Breisgau-Geschichtsvereins [Schau-ins-Land], 103, year 1984, pp. 118 ff., and in Hugo Ott, Martin Heidegger. Unterwegs zu einer Biogra- phie (Frankfurt a. M./New York, 1988).

In 1935, through Marianne Weber, who was a relative of Eduard Baumgarten, Jaspers received a copy of Heidegger's letter of evaluation of Baumgarten, which Baumgarten himself had procured. At the time, Jaspers did not make himself a copy. In 1945, Baumgarten dictated to Jaspers a summary of the evaluation from memory and, only much later, in 1961, he

sent Jaspers a literal transcript from his diary of 1935. The sense of the text from 1945 is identical with the transcript of 1961 but differs in wording. In Jaspers's memory, the sense of the summary of 1945 was also identical with the copy he had read in 1935. Hugo Ott found an additional copy among the papers of Clemens Bauer (see Martin Heidegger als Rektor, loc. cit., p. 129).

That in 1935 an evaluation of Baumgarten by Heidegger was submitted to the office of the leader of the Dozents' Association, Dr. Blume, was later confirmed by Frau Grete Paquin, the secretary at the time, in a document that is found among Jaspers's papers. On this matter, Jaspers trusted in Baumgarten's testimony and written documents, although he never saw the original evaluation which was probably destroyed with the rest of the holdings of the Dozents' Association. We must conclude from this that he believed Heidegger was capable of such things.

7. "Caute" [caution] was impressed into Spinoza's seal.

8. Cf. Plato, The Republic, 496d.

9. In the middle of May, 1945, Heidegger's house was placed on a black list by the provisional city government. This meant it was designated for confiscation. An appeal against the decision for confiscation was rejected. The house was considered a so-called party residence, and was thus made available to serve the needs of the French occupying forces. Heidegger's library was likewise designated for confiscation. Ultimately, Heidegger was allowed to remain in his house but under very reduced living conditions-two additional families were temporarily quartered there.

On the lengthy and complicated proceedings pertaining to Heidegger's status at the University of Freiburg, see Hugo Ott, Martin Heidegger and die Universitat Freiburg nach 1945, loc. cit., pp. 101 ff. On January 19, 1946, the senate of the University of Freiburg decided to relegate Heidegger to emeritus status under prohibition from teaching. It also refused to reconsider the case after the prescribed period of time and requested that the Rector inform Heidegger that, in the future, he was expected to exercise discretion at all public events sponsored by the university. The military government

toughened the sanctions in not approving emeritus status for Heidegger, but it did provide the pension.

10. Since these verbal recommendations did not bear fruit, in 1949 Jaspers wrote a letter, by arrangement with the Rector of the University of Freiburg, Professor Gerd Tellenbach, with which he wanted to help toward securing for Heidegger the full rights of an emeritus Professor:

Basel, the 5th of June, 1949

To the Rector of the University of Freiburg

Herr Professor Dr. Tellenbach

Magnifizenz!

Due to his achievements in philosophy, Herr Professor Martin Heidegger is recognized as one of the most important contemporary philosophers in the entire world. In Germany, there is no one who would surpass him. His almost hidden philosophizing, which stands in feeling with the deepest questions, and is only indirectly recognizable in his publications, perhaps makes him today, in a world that is philosophically impoverished, a unique figure.

Europe and Germany have an obligation following from the affirmation of intellectual quality and intellectual ability to see to it that a man like Heidegger can work in peace, continue his writings, and bring them to publication.

This will only be assured if Heidegger attains the status of an emeritus Professor Ordinarius. With this, he will gain the right, not the obligation, to give lectures. He would also have effect again as a Dozent. I consider this to be supportable and even desirable. To be sure, in my opinion of 1945, I asserted the principle that we must temporarily steer away from the idea of the university according to which everything that has intellectual merit, even if it is foreign to the university's liberality, should have its effect in an institution of higher

learning, for the education of a youth whose critical thinking has been weakened by National Socialism demands that we do not expose them, so to speak, to all the possibilities for uncritical thinking. After the current developments in Germany, I can no longer hold to this principle. As my evaluation anticipated, Heidegger's reinstatement should he reexamined after a few years. The time now seems to be ripe. In my opinion, the German University can no longer leave Heidegger aside.

Therefore, I most sincerely support granting Heidegger the rights of an emeritus Professor.

In deepest respect,

Yours Faithfully,

Karl Jaspers

11. There follows a stricken passage:

My letter to Freiburg in reply to the inquiry about you is only one of nearly countless private and public expressions of opinion that I risked in the first impulse for a moral restoration. I did not dodge questions when I was asked. To make an error in doing this seemed to me worse than ever, as it is for every German who says anything-and error is almost unavoidable-therefore, I am anxious because everything depends on truth. Here is the only thing that is possible for us in our powerlessness. Concealment is bad. If clarity, at least, will grow out of my errors, and if they can be put right again, then it must be risked. Soon I will no longer continue in this way but, at least on the essentials, I will draw back into pure philosophy.

12. Karl Jaspers, Geleitwort, in Die Wandlung Issue I, 1945-46, no. 1, pp. 3-6.

Karl Jaspers, Erneuerung der Universitdt. Eine Rede [Reforming the University] loc. cit., pp. 66-74.

1. A copy in Heidegger's papers with a note in Jaspers's handwriting: "Copy of a handwritten letter"; this original letter is not extant; see the following letter from Heidegger.

2. Cf. Letter 125 of March 1, 1948, note 12.

3. Ibid., notes 4 and 5.

4. Ibid., note 6.

5. The exact circumstances cannot be determined.

6. Ibid., note 5.

7. At the height of the persecution of Jews, Gertrud Jaspers, who, as a Jew, was particularly threatened, occasionally had to be hidden. Above all, she was almost completely cut off from social contact.

8. In March of 1933; cf. Letter 113 of March 16, 1933 from Heidegger to Jaspers.

9. Jean Wahl, 1888-1974; French philosopher; from 1927 professor at the Sorbonne; was one of the first to make German Existenzphilosophie known in France through several publications; cf. especially Etudes Kierkegaardiennes (Paris, 1958); La pensee de l'existence (Paris, 1951).

10. Lettre de M. M. Heidegger. Reponse a M. J. Wahl (Societe francaise de Philosophie, seance du 4 decembre 1937. Subjectivite et transcendance) in Bulletin de la Societe francaise de Philosophie, 37 (Paris, 1937), p. 193.

Lettre de M. Karljaspers, loc. cit., pp. 195-98. Also in connection with Jean Wahl: Existence humaine et transcendence (Neuchatel, 1944), pp. 134ff.; 138-42.

11. In his short letter, Heidegger stressed that, although there is talk in Being and Time about "Existent" and "Kierkegaard," his philosophical

efforts were not to be included under the concept of "Existenzphilosophie." He agrees completely with jean Wahl that Existenzphilosophie is in double danger of falling either into theology or into abstraction. He is not concerned with the question of human existence, but with the question of being as a whole and as such. The question that is put in Being and Time was never taken up before, neither by Kierkegaard nor by Nietzsche, and Jaspers completely bypasses it.

Jaspers stressed, in his much longer reply of January 30, 1938, that "I nowhere claim a knowledge of all being, but only a knowledge of the `modes of the encompassing'." Every mode of the encompassing touches upon the limits that belong to it, and in so doing reaches the point "where the limits to another space can be broken through, until rest becomes possible only in transcendence." This rest cannot be known in any way. Totality also has different meanings; for even it is only to be understood in each case according to a mode of the encompassing. In contrast with Kierkegaard, Jaspers denies "faith in a transcendence that does not reveal, confirm, and prove itself in our world"; but he does not deny transcendence. He would "reject every `substitution' of worldly concepts for eternity as a delusion." "That in my philosophy a homesickness speaks in the manner of one who is lost, that an echo of religion resounds in it, I would not deny." But he believes he can detect this homesickness in all philosophy that stands in the shadow of Plato and Kant. A theory of existence would have to exclude existence. "Existentialism would be the death of Existenzphilosophie..." Philosophy can only awaken. Whoever communicates by philosophizing "must gain the opposite of what is dictatorial, in that he almost disappears in what appears to be a kind of docility and softness, and in opening a space for the one who hears, entirely for himself." The concreteness of psychologizing must "be overcome." "Philosophizing must attempt the abstraction that can move the deepest reality through its form." Philosophy is not, like science, a "separable truth." The concrete analyses of his philosophy may always traverse the psychological, in order to be intensive presentations of possible Existenz. "That a philosophy is existential is ... an impossiblity. Only a human being is a possible existence in being temporal." "That Heidegger is named along with me, as if we were doing the same thing is, it seems to me, for both of us a cause for being misunderstood. A critical and negative

stance toward the traditional philosophy of the universities and a dependence upon concepts from Kierkegaard was perhaps common to us. But we are separated by the contents from which we philosophize."

127

1. See note 2 to Letter 22 from June 18, 1924.

128

1. On June 22, 1949.

2. Frank became an Ordinarius in Freiburg in 1928.

129

1. Erich Frank, Die Philosophic von Jaspers, in Theologische Rundschau, New Series, year 1933, no. 5, pp. 301-18.

130

1. In addition to this letter, there is in Jaspers's papers a fragment of an outline that the letter only partly includes.

2. Jaspers's ancestors on his mother's side (Tantzen family) were mostly peasants in Butjadingen and Jeverland, and the ancestors on his father's side were peasants, merchants, and pastors.

3. The outline fragment elaborates as follows:

> I have not been able to discover, even in embryo, a common moral rebirth. What people have made out of me has nothing to do with philosophy. When, at the beginning of 1946, I rejected the toocrazy talk about me-then on the radio to the German youth: I am supposed to be an oak ... and other nonsense-in a newspaper notice with the concluding sentence: I am no hero and don't want to be taken for

one*-the large newspaper that published this talk did not print my rejection (it didn't fit the style, which wasn't exactly honest)-and only small papers printed my notice-and whoever took note of it was perplexed and didn't understand me. This is only one symptom among many of not grasping what I am about, and then I saw indications that, in remaining in Heidelberg, I would be celebrated as a national hero. The awkwardness of my situation would have become grotesque-for a German, to be sure, it would certainly remain awkward in any case. Here in Basel I feel at home with foreign people who are intelligent, educated, humane, and have common sense-where everyone knows J. Burckhardt and a few even understand him. One writes a valuable biography** about him with new disclosures. Young people from around the world, visits from friends and relatives who wouldn't be able go to Heidelberg, freedom from living under an occupying power upon whose withdrawal a person like me would also be exposed to every uncertainty-all of this, and much else, I may take to be a modest happiness offered by fate. Since we saw each other last my illness has not improved. But the living conditions here have brought me, since a year ago, into unexpectedly good, vital circumstances (despite many interruptions by illness). I work happily and do nothing else.

*The declaration "Against False Heroization," which Jaspers published in the Rhein-Neckar-Zeitung of January 1, 1946.

**The 7-volume Burckhardt biography by the Basel historian Werner Kaegi, whose first volume appeard in Basel in 1947.

4. Fifth, expanded edition, with an Introduction and Afterword, Frankfurt a. M. 1949.

131

1. Martin Heidegger, "What is Metaphysics," in Pathmarks, pp. 82-96.

Martin Heidegger, "On the Essence of Truth," in Pathmarks, pp. 136-54.

Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanisim," in Pathmarks, pp. 239-76.

2. For several years, Jaspers spent the summer vacation in St. Moritz in the house of his friend Hans Walz, a Heidelberg doctor.

3. Martin Heidegger, "Plato's Doctrine of Truth," in Pathmarks, pp. 155-82. Published in a Swiss edition with the "Letter on Humanism" (Bern, 1947).

4. "Letter on Humanism," Pathmarks, pp. 249ff.

5. Ibid., p. 239.

132

1. Unsere Zukunft and Goethe [Our Future and Goethe] (Zurich, 1948). Goethes Menschlichkeit [Goethe's Humanity] (Basel, 1949). "Philosophie and Wissenschaft," ["Philosophy and Science"] (Inaugural Address at the University of Basel), in Die Wandlung 3/1948, pp. 721-33.

2. Ernst Robert Curtius, 1886-1956; Romanist in Marburg, Heidelberg, and Bonn. Published, inter alia: Eurpdische Literature and lateinisches Mittelalter [European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages] (Bern, 1948); Kritische Essays zur europkischen Literatur [Critical Essays on European Literature] (Bern, 1950). Had great authority among the Romanists. Heidegger's reference is to three pamphlets Curtius published against Jaspers's Goethe critique: "Goethe oderJaspers?' ["Goethe or Jaspers?"], Die Tat, April 2, 1949; "Darf man Jaspers Angreifen?' ["May One Attack Jaspers?"], Rhein-NeckarZeitung, May 17, 1949; "Goethe, Jaspers, Curtius," Die Zeit, July 2, 1949.

3. Georg Lukacs, 1885-1971; Hungarian philosopher and Marxist; professor in Budapest who was also very engaged politically. Published,

inter alia: Geschichte and Klassenbewuftsein [History and Class Consciousness] (Berlin, 1923). Vehemently attacked Heidegger after the war in the article "Heidegger redivivus," in Sinn and Form, year 1, no. 3, 1949, pp. 37-62.

4. "Lessing fiber die Windmuhlen" ["Lessing on the Windmills"], in Hamburger Dramaturgie, (piece 77), vol. 5, p. 223 of the Petersen/Olshausen edition (Berlin, Leipzig, Vienna, and Stuttgart, 1925): "so the gentlemen have fought well; their imagination turns windmills into giants."

5. Paul Shih-Yi Hsiao, 1911-1986; worked on the Herder Encyclopedia and participated in Heidegger's lecture courses in the 1940s; from 1974 until his death, he was professor at FU-Jen University in Taipei.

6. Heraklit and Parmenides.

7. See Pathmarks.

133

1. Cf. Letter 129 of July 7, 1949 from Heidegger to Jaspers.

2. At the end of his critique, Lukacs reproaches Heidegger for remaining stuck in a general "existentialist world-picture, from which Sartre and his students desperately try to find a way into social reality, and in which Jaspers absorbs himself in vain self-reflection." ("Heidegger redivivus," loc. cit., p. 61). A more detailed comparison is not included in the critique.

3. From 1945 to 1949 Sergei I. Tulpanov was the chief of information Administration for the Soviet Military Administration in Germany. He was charged with representing the interests of the Soviet Union in the area of political life within the Soviet zone of occupation. His office was, in fact, the place for Soviet censorship of the press, radio, and cultural activities. The remarks on the personal attack is possibly in reference to the seventh volume (July 1949) of the journal Einheit [Unity] (the "Theoretical Journal of Scientific Socialism," edited by the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party), where, on pp. 664ff., there is a report entitled "Ideological

Offensive." It states, among other things: ". . . an Initiative Committee composed of Soviet and German comrades decided to take the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the appearance of Lenin's Materialism and Emperi- ocriticism to invite a wide audience to a five-day philosophical discussion in the House of Soviet Culture ... The meeting was essentially a general offensive of dialectical materialism, represented from all sides, against those who are hostile to progress in all the forms in which Idealism appears today. After an introduction by comrade Prof. Tulpanov, who outlined the program of struggle for the entire assembly ... comrades Dr. Georg Mende and Prof. Peter Steiniger characterized the existential philosophy of anxiety of the uprooted petit-bourgeousie, the former in its German and the latter in its French versions...." (The editor thanks Dr. Vincent von Vroblevsky, East Berlin, for this information.)

4. Karl Jaspers, Die Idee der Universitl t [The Idea of the University] (1946).

5. This may refer to the Romanist Werner Krauss (b. 1900), the coeditor of the journal Die Wandlung, which was set up in Leipzig and Berlin in 1947.

6. In connection with several lectures at the first Rencontres Internationales de Geneve in 1946, there occasionally took place a confrontation between Lukacs and Jaspers. Cf. Benda et al., L'Esprit Europeen. Textes in- extenso des conferences et des entretiens organises par les Rencontres Inter- nationles de Geneve (Neuchatel, 1946), pp. 198ff, 249ff, 325ff.

7. Cf. Karl Jaspers, Heidelberger Erinnerungen [Heidelberg Memories].

8. Cf. Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism" in Pathmarks.

9. Cf. especially the fifth chapter of the Weltgeschictlichen Betrach- tungen by Jacob Burckhardt: "Das Individuum and das Allgemeine. (Die his- torische Grofef ["The Individual and the Universal (The Historically Great)".]

10. Karl Jaspers, Vom europaischen Geist [On the European Spirit]. Lecture, held at the Rencontres Internationales de Geneve, September 1946 (Munich, 1947).

it Karl Jaspers, The Origin and Goal of History.

12. Vom Ursprung and Ziel der Geschichte, Zurich edition, pp. 126ff.

13. Ibid., pp. 108ff.

14. Oberengadin, where from 1879 Nietzsche often stayed during the summer months.

15. The reference is to the book by Franz Josef Brecht, Schicksal and Auftrag des Menschen. Philosophische Interpretationen zu Rainer Maria Rilkes Duineser Elegien" [The Fate and Task of Man: Philosophical Interpretations of Rainer Maria Rilke's Duino Elegies], which appeared in Germany in 1948 and a year later in Basel. Brecht had the Basel publisher send a copy to Jaspers.

16. Otto Friedrich Bollnow, Existenzphilosophie, in Systematische Philosphie, ed. Nicolai Hartmann, (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1942), pp. 313-430, esp. P. 382.

134

1. Karl Jaspers, The Origin and Goal of History, and "On the European Spirit."

2. Martin Heidegger-Sincerely, K. J.

3. Cf. Karl Jaspers, The Origin and Goal of History (German ed., pp. 18ff)

4. See "Letter on Humanism," Pathmarks, pp. 259ff.

135

1. On September 26, 1949.

2. On March 3, 1949, Jaspers wrote a letter about Heidegger to Kate Victorius, a former student of Heidegger's, which gives the nuances of his relationship with him. We quote from this the pertinent passage:

> I have just read Heidegger's Foreword.* In sad memory: there is still in it the same impetus toward what is decisive in philosophizing, which I perceived in him now thirty years ago. But this Foreword, as something contemporary, is not readable without a slight displeasure that at least resonated with me. In comparison with earlier years, there are two things that are different: While before he "avoided" Being and Time and didn't read it, now he treats it, interprets it, and protects it from being misunderstood like a canonical book and then he goes more than ever for "talking about it," which he had rejected so much, instead of bringing this thinking to fulfillment. It is an awakening of expectations that are not met. It is a promise of youth that someone still makes when he is no longer young-but the main thing yet remains: He has touched upon something essential. On this path, it would have been a matter of articulating more clearly what is meant by "representation" [Irorstellen] and "commemoration" [Andenken], words he uses to convey the difference between "metaphysics" and authentic philosophy. On this, people have said much more penetrating things long ago (e.g., Schelling). I would like Heidegger to publish his larger manuscripts, then we would see what is going on; but I am also satisfied, as in earlier years, that he is someone who knows something that few today, or hardly anyone, even have an idea of. Despite all of the profound differences, his voice sounds, in all of the strangeness of his diction, like one friendly to me. If he is right that philosophizing of such a kind "comes about" ["sich ereignet'] and is not thought merely objectively-and I completely agree with him in this-then it must show itself in personal actions and conduct as well. I don't mean the old nonsense about "living according to his doctrine," but living according to its standard. When we cannot prove or disprove what we are about with scientifically compelling arguments,

but only with our own essence, then this is the human language that is inseparable from such philosophizing.

136

1. Note by Jaspers to Letter 136 of November 23, 1949: "immediately answered (,) also written to Tellenbach."

2. Der Feldweg [The Field Path].

3. Holzwege (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1950). Literally: Wood Paths. English translation: Off the Beaten Track, ed. and trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

4. Refers to the "initiative" taken by Gerd Tellenbach, the Rector of the University of Freiburg i. Br., on the matter of Heidegger's reinstatement. For this, Jaspers wrote the letter quoted in note 10 to the unsent letter (125) of March 1, 1948.

137

1. The copy is provided with the dedication: "For Karl Jaspers with sincere greetings. Martin Heidegger. Nov. 1949."

138

1. Paul Hiihnerfeld, "Philosophen Pragen das Bild der Zeit. Sartre and Jaspers in neuern Bilchern" ["Philosophers Imprint the Image of the Times"] (p. 9). In this article, Paul Huhnerfeld reviews Jaspers's work The Origin and Goal of History, which appeared in the same year in Munich as well as in Zurich.

2. Refers to the following passage:

> But the question of the meaning of the whole of history does not allow any final answer. However, the question and the critically increasing attempts to find an answer help to remedy the hasty conclusions of a quick pseudoknowledge that immediately disappear again-the tendency to merely make one's own age, which can so easily be disparaged, look bad-the complete declarations of bankruptcy that today seem almost outmoded-the claims to bringing about an entirely new foundation that will save us from now on, and is contrasted with the entire development from Plato to Hegel or Nietzsche as an overcoming. The meaning of one's own thinking will then take on a singular elevation by means of its paltry content (in mimicry of an extreme but well-founded state of consciousness as in Nietzsche). But the pompous gestures of naysaying and beseeching the Nothing are not an actual reality. From the sensation of struggle one can only lead a spiritual pseudolife for so long, until one's capital is squandered.

3. Basel, December 2, 1949

Most honorable editorial staff.

In the Zeit of December 1, 1949, Paul Huhnerfeld reviews my book The Origin and Goal of History. He talks about two weaknesses "the second is even more questionable; it consists in a furious attack on Heidegger (without mentioning him by name) and characterizes his thinking as a thinking with paltry content." I declare that I never spoke about Heidegger in this book.

But how is such an apparently well-intended misunderstanding possible? The cited passage was hard for me to find because only the words "a thinking with paltry content" were quoted. The paragraph in which they occur characterizes an attitude of naysaying toward the present age, which is connected with an exaggerated consciousness of a new foundation. Such a depiction grows out of observations, supplements them with imagination, and excludes what doesn't fit. It is thus in its meaning not a species under which a person is included, but an ideal type according to which individual people can be measured, and each person can measure themselves as to how far they may or may not match it. As to experiences for such a

schematization, there are today manifestations of speaking and writing, especially in National Socialism, but also in so-called existentialism, especially in its imitators. The reviewer has confused the schema of an ideal type with a judgment about a particular personality. He went against my meaning in applying my statements to Heidegger.

If I wanted to publicly seek a critical confrontation with Heidegger-whom I was not at all talking about-I would also do it openly. My relation to this important thinker, until now and for a long time essentially a private one, cannot be muddled by such remarks. However, a correction seems necessary to me in order to prevent false rumors.

Karl Jaspers

4. The entire critical passage runs as follows:

The captivating book has two weaknesses: The first is its style, which unfortunately is not free of false images and in this it makes simple things difficult to understand and brings the truth of its assertions under suspicion. The second is even more questionable; it consists in a furious attack on Heidegger (without mentioning him by name) and characterizes his thinking as a thinking "with paltry content." Such a confusion is as little worthy of an author of the rank of Karl Jaspers as it corresponds with the philosophy of the thinker from Freiburg or with the nobility of a genuine philosophical expression.

5. The letter to Die Zeit was printed on December 22, 1949, under the title "Heidegger Was Not Meant."

139

1. Refers to The Origin and Goal of History.

2. Jose Ortega y Gasset, 1885-1955; Spanish philosopher; professor in Madrid. Representive of perspectivism in regard to the possibility of grasping reality. Published inter alia: The Revolt of the Masses (La rebelion

de las masas, Madrid, 1929); European Culture and European Peoples; Past and Future in Today's Humanity.

3. "On the Essence of Truth," Pathmarks, pp. 136-54.

4. "A Look into That Which Is" was the collective title of the Bremen lectures: "The Thing, The Enframing [now `The Question Concerning Technology'], The Danger, The Turning."

5. Gunther Sawatzki came from Danzig and studied with Jaspers during the winter semester of 1927-28. He took his degree from the Technical University of Danzig-Langfuhr with the dissertation Das Problem des Dichters als Motiv in der Entu'icklung Soren Kierkegaards bis 1841 [The Problem of the Poet as Motive in the Development of Soren Kierkegaard up to 18411 (Borna-Leipzig, 1935).

140

1. Cf. Letter 138 of December 2, 1949, note 5.

2. Presumably refers to the situation report in Letter 136 of November 23, 1949.

3. Cf. Letter 102 of May 24, 1930 and Letter 110 of Dember 24, 1931.

4. Samuel Clarke, 1675-1729, English moral philosopher, mathemati cian, and theologian; from 1707 preacher in London. Leibniz exchanged a series of polemical letters with him in the years 1715-16. For details on the motives and themes, cf. Die Philosophischen Schriften von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, ed. C. J. Gerhardt, seventh volume (Berlin, 1890), pp. 347-51.

5. The copy was provided with the dedication "to Karl Jaspers with sincere greetings. Martin Heidegger. December 12, 1949."

6. Martin Heidegger, "The Word of Nietzsche: `God is Dead.'"

7. Martin Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture."

8. Martin Heidegger, "What Are Poets For?"

9. Added to this on the endpaper: "Strange coincidences with me, without influence if Heidegger did not complete these writings after reading mine, since 1945. The latter is very unlikely."

10. Under Heidegger's explanation of the title Holzwege [Woodpaths] Jaspers wrote in his dedication copy: Woodpaths mean paths that serve for transporting felled timber, not for passing through. Wood paths are not forest paths."

11. Jaspers had read Holzwege intensively (with the exception of "The Origin of the Work of Art" and, in part, "Hegel's Concept of Experience") and had provided them with many glosses.

141

1. Refers to the lifting of the ban from teaching and the granting of a pension with approval for later granting of emeritus status.

2. Visit of Hannah Arendt in Freiburg at the beginning of February 1950.

3. Cf. letter 127 of June 22, 1949.

4. Julius Wilser, 1888-1949; professor in Freiburg i. Br.; from 1934 Ordinarius in paleontology in Heidelberg. Was chancellor of the university during Heidegger's rectorate.

142

1. Abbrevation for Security Service (Sicherheitsdienst).

2. The historian Paul Schmitthenner was Rector from November 1, 1938, to March 1945 and was at the same time (1940-45) Minister for Culture and Instruction in Karlsruhe.

143

1. Karl Jaspers, The Idea of the University (1946); Nietzsche and Christianity, The Question of German Guilt.

2. The German original edition could only be sold with great difficulty, while the Swiss License Issue reached four editions within a year.

3. The title of the lecture was "The Spiritual Situation in Germany."

144

1. Cf. note 1 to Jaspers's Letter 143 of March 25, 1950. The comment probably refers to The Question of German Guilt.

2. Wilhelm v. Mollendorf, 1887-1944; professor of anatomy. Also see The Rectorate 1933-34. Facts and Thoughts.

3. Prelate Josef Sauer, cf. Letter 114, note 3.

4. Paul Gunther, 1892-1969; professor of physical and electrochemistry. In 1949, he was Rector of the Technical University of Karlsruhe.

5. Eduard Kern, 1887-1972; jurist. Was the successor to Heidegger as Rector in 1934. Was allowed to resume his professorship in Ttibigen as early as 1946.

6. Martin Heidegger, "Nietzsche's Word: `God is Dead.'"

145

1. Martin Heidegger, Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics.

2. Karl Jaspers, Introduction to Philosophy: Twelve Radio Addresses.

3. "Comments on Karl Jaspers's Psychology of Worldviews," in Pathmarks. Critiques the idea of the "limit situation" as the center of

philosophy and also Jaspers's method.

146

1. An outline found among Jaspers's papers, provided with the note from July 1952: "Perhaps I did not write this letter, but a shorter one." Not found among Heidegger's papers. Most likely, Jaspers only sent letter 147.

2. Jaspers was invited by the General Student Committee of the University of Heidelberg to give three guest lectures, which he delivered at the end of the summer semester of 1950. They were published in Munich the same year under the title Reason and Anti-Reason in Our Time. Nothing came of the prospective meeting with Heidegger.

3. Karl Jaspers, Truth and Symbol.

4. Ibid.

5. Karl Jaspers, Philosophy, Part II The Illumination of Existence.

149

1. For crossing the border into the Federal Republic.

2. The atomic physicist Wolfgang Gentner, 1906-1980, and his wife Alice, nee Pfaehler. Gentner was at the time an Ordinarius in Physics in Freiburg i. Br.; in 1958, he was appointed Director of the Max Planck Institute for Atomic Physics in Heidelberg.

3. Cf. Letter 131 of August 6, 1949, from Jaspers to Heidegger, note 2.

4. Since early youth, Jaspers suffered from bronchitis, which could lead to pneumonia even with small colds.

5. Cf. letter 132 of August 12, 1949, from Heidegger to Jaspers.

6. Refers to the rumor that, in the fall of 1949, Heidegger had said to the Heidelberg literary historian Paul Bockmann that Jaspers had plagiarized from his thought early on, for which reason he had broken off his connection with Jaspers in 1933; whereupon Jaspers inflicted severe damage upon him in his letter to the Freiburg denazification committee in 1945 (as reported in a letter from Kurt Rossmann to Jaspers from March 29, 1950).

7. Hannah Arendt, who during her visits to Europe often visited Heidegger when she left Basel. It is not known how she settled the scandalmongering.

8. Letter 141 of March 7, 1950, from Heidegger to Jaspers.

9. Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitariansim (New York: Harcourt, 1951).

10. Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," Pathmarks, p. 259:

> Because Marx by experiencing estrangement attains an essential dimension of history, the Marxist view of history is superior to that of other historical accounts ... No matter which of the various positions one chooses to adopt toward the doctrines of communism and to their foundation, from the point of view of the history of being it is certain that an elemental experience of what is worldhistorical speaks out in it.

11. Letter 122 of May 16, 1936, from Jaspers to Heidegger.

150

1. Jaspers's seventieth birthday.

151

1.

I have received very many good wishes from friends and acquaintances, from students from all periods in my teaching career, and from officials and institutions. I have received letters, telegrams, flowers and gifts in such great numbers that I am now embarrassed with great gratitude. I would sincerely and expressly like to write to each one of you; but carrying this out is not physically possible. Therefore I ask you to grant me your favor once again and allow me to express my thanks in this form. I have made every sign of appreciation and affection that have come to me present in my mind, and internally responded in reflective silence and thankful affection.

Karl Jaspers

Basel, February 1953

2. Cf. in reference to this: Emil Durr, Jacob Burckhardt als politischer Publizist. Mit seinen Zeitungsberichten aus den Jahren 1844-45. From the papers of E. Durr, ed. Werner Kaegi (Zurich, 1957), esp. the column from May 3, 1845, pp. 115ff.

3. Cf. the afterword in the piece cited above by Werner Kaegi, esp. pp. 178-82.

4. For years, Jaspers planned a book about Germany that he wanted to give the title Deutsches Selbstbewu$tsein [German Self-Consciousness].

5. The source cannot he specified.

6. The Great Philosophers, whose first volume appeared in 1957.

152

1. Found only among Jaspers's papers, with the note "duplicate."

2. Jaspers spent his vacation at the time in Cannes, in the house of the physician Dr. Hans Walz.

3. On September 26.

4. In number 155 of the Notizen, Jaspers considers what he "could perhaps write for Heidegger's seventieth birthday":

> This is an occasion that I find very fitting to convey to you my best wishes and my respect. Indeed, among my contemporaries, I have found only one who appeared to me to be a genuinely great philosopher: Max Weber. But when I look away from him, I see no one except you among my "professional colleagues" who could have moved me but for useful achievements like his, and that means as a philosopher. You were from early on a man who knew something about what philosophy is. At one time, you encouraged me by your existence in the adacemic world. I can express my thanks to you in detail. But against my expectations at the beginning, you seem to have become the representative of a power that, hesitatingly and without being ultimately clear about you, I oppose in my endeavors. If fate grants it, I would still like to try to develop my critique against you, as in the saying of Nietzsche's: "What I attack, I honor." It is difficult because for this kind of polemic there is no model. I have often thought of what it could be. But carrying it out is something different from knowing the principles it would have to follow. I would have to read all of your things, which I always only came to know in piecemeal fashion and just as quickly put down again because they didn't nourish me. What you meant to me in direct conversation does not reappear in your published works.
>
> It is perhaps appropriate that we didn't see each other again after 1945. I didn't intentionally avoid it nor did I seek it. What I have heard and seen since then has deeped what I would have to see in you as National Socialist-alas, what kind of a National Socialist, who also wasn't one!-and has made clearer the unavoidable, still publicly anonymous antagonism toward you. To express this in a philosophical way, (i.e., in a way that sees the socalled "matter" and personal existence at one with each other), is perhaps a task that lies beyond my abilities.

If I were to try this, I would do it with the personal tendency, at the end, to make a possible connection between us which so far did not exist or was only an illusion. As I reported in my autobiography for the Schilp volume, I saw, as I wrote then, that it wouldn't work. I then took out the section and didn't mention your name at all. This silence must have been conspicuous and palpable even for a reader who was only distantly informed.

I think it is possible that such a polemic would serve philosophy through our persons, especially if you were to reply and if there were a unity between us, which we saw as a possiblity around 1949.

153

1. February 23, 1963.

155

1. Found only in Jaspers's papers as an outline with the note: "Not sent, a shorter letter instead."

2. The outline contains several transcription aids as well as corrections in Hannah Arendt's handwriting; she came to Basel for Jaspers's eightieth birthday and spent the time until July in Europe.

3. Cf. Letter 111 of December 8, 1932: "You should now bring out a work next to Philosophy which would be called Philosophers."

4. Karl Jaspers, Lebensfragen der deutschen Politik [Questions of Life for German Politics].

5. On October 30, 1966, Jaspers wrote down the following comments and placed them with the letters to and from Heidegger:

Supplemented with many other letters that did not seem important to me for remembrance.

This correspondence can scarcely be understood without the background of the factual relationships and feelings between us at the time. In reading it, it seems as if sometimes a currrent of insincerity runs though it. From my side, there are perhaps false expectations; likewise with Heidegger, but above all in keeping silent or in trying to understand possibilities he believed in at the moment.

What is true about it is hard to clarify. That is what depresses me. I do not doubt that at times there is real seriousness in it.

I remember two turning points. In the winter of 1923-24, Heidegger was with us. I had heard through Lowith-that Afra Geiger [a student of Jaspers and Heidegger] heard Heidegger had expressed a very derogatory opinion about my Idea of the University and made the statement: "We cannot be comrades in arms." I told Heidegger that with our friendly relations I had expected that he would have conveyed such a judgment to me personally. The sharpest criticisms are welcome, but between us, directly. To talk about our relations to others invalidates our friendship. Heidegger: "What they told you is not true; I never said anything like that." I: "Then as far as I am concerned, the matter is settled. I believe you." Whereupon Heidegger said, apparently moved (I still see it and still feel it): "I never did such a thing." It was a moment that seemed as if our friendship had just then been established. I really believed him! But I made a mistake. Later I became uncertain.

The second turning point was in May [on June 30-ed.] of 1933. Heidegger came to give a talk in Heidelberg as a National Socialist and, before the talk, he was greeted by NS Student Leader Scheel as comrade Heidegger. As always, he stayed with us. When I went up to his room to greet him after his arrival, I said: "Today it is just like 1914..." I wanted to add: "the mass psychosis lasted then for at most three months ..." But I didn't say it because I saw Heidegger, in his enthusiasm, agreeing with me in an entirely different sense. Then it

struck me: I did not trust him, and I kept silent. The growing mistrust of his character disappointed me. I did not explain to him what kind of catastrophe had occurred. I was cautious. I did discuss the Jewish question with him the next day. He said the usual cliches about "the international, ..." etc., but without inner conviction. He was no "anti-Semite." Because of my caution, I did not take the risk. He knew that I was a radical opponent. But the confrontation did not take place. At the time, it probably would not have at all interested him. It was also the last time we saw one another.

The Notes on Martin Heidegger contain several passages that are in letter form (cf. numbers 93, 95, 155) or are a direct address (numbers 61, 64, 76, 99, 103, 158, 169, 247). We must assume that Jaspers intentionally excluded these passages from the correspondence (e.g., as letters "not sent"). For a time, he intended to write his Heidegger critique in letter form to make it more lively and, above all, more communicative. Accordingly, the form of these passages has a literary, fictive character, which does not hold for the letters that he expressly characterizes as unsent letters. Therefore, in our edition we followed Jaspers's own arrangement.

The Letters and the Notes are to be read as mutually completing and correcting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS BY MARTIN HEIDEGGER AND KARL JASPERS

Cited by the Editors

MARTIN HEIDEGGER

1919-21 "Anmerkungen zu Karl Jaspers Psychologie der Weltanschauungen," in Wegmarken, ed. F.-W. v. Herrmann (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1976), GA 9, pp. 1-44. "Comments on Karl Jaspers's Psychology of Worldviews" in Pathmarks, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 1-38.

1921-22 Phdnomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles: Einfuhrung in die phanomenologische Forschung (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1985), GA 61.

1923 Ontologie (Hermeneutik der Faktizitat), ed. Kate BrOcker-Oltmanns (Frankfurt a. M: Klostermann, 1988), GA 63.

1923-24 Einfuhrung in die phdnomenologische Forschung (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1994), GA 17.

1925 Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs, ed. Petra Jaeger (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1979), GA 20. History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena, trans. Theodore Kisiel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

1927 Die Grundprobleme der Phanomenologie (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1975), GA 24. The Basic Problems of Phenomenology, trans. Albert Hofstadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982).

1927 Hegels Phanomenolgie des Geistes (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1980), GA 32. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988).

1927 Sein and Zeit (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1977), GA 2. Being and Time, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

1927-28 Phanomenlogische Interpretationen von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1987), GA 25. Phenomenological Interpretations of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997).

1928 Metaphysische Anfangsgrunde der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1978), GA 26. The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic, trans. Michael Heim (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).

1929 Der Deutschen Idealismus (Fichte, Hegel, Schelling) and die philosophische Problemlage der Gegenwart (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1997), GA 28.

1929 Kant and das Problem der Metaphysik (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1973), GA 3. English translation: Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics, trans. Richard Taft (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990).

1929 "Vom Wesen des Grundes" in Erganzungsband zum jahrbuch fur Philosophie and phanomenologische Forschung (Halle, 1929), pp. 71-100. "The Essence of Reasons," bilingual edition, trans. Terrence Malick (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969).

1929 "Was ist Metaphysik?" in Wegmarken, pp. 103-21. "What is Metaphysics?" in Pathmarks, pp. 82-96.

1931-32 "Platons Lerhre von der Wahrheit," in Wegmarken, pp. 201-36. "Plato's Doctrine of Truth," trans. Thomas Sheehan in Pathmarks, pp.

155-82.

1933 Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universitdt, Das Rektorat 1933-34: Tatsache and Gedanken (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1983). "The Self-Assertion of the German University, The Rectorate 1933-34: Facts and Thoughts," trans. Karsten Harries, Review of Metaphysics 38 (1985): 467-502.

1935 Einfuhrung in die Metaphysik (Frankfurt a. M.: 1983), GA 40. Intro duction to Metaphysics, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

1936 "Holderlin and das Wesen der Dichtung" in Erlduterungen zu Holderlins Dichtung (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1981), GA 4, pp. 33-48. "Holderlin and the Essence of Poetry" in Elucidations of Holderlin's Poetry, trans. Keith Hoeller (Amherst: Humanity Books, 2000), pp. 51-65.

1936-46 Nietzsche, 2 vols. (Pfullingen: Neske, 1961). Nietzsche, 4 vols., trans. David Farrell Krell (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979-87).

1938 "Die Zeit des Weltbildes" in Holzwege, pp. 73-110. "The Age of the World Picture" in Off the Beaten Track, ed. and trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes (Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 57-85.

1941 Holderlins Hymne "Wie Wenn am Feiertag" in Erlauterungen zu Holderlins Dichtung, pp. 49-77. HOlderlin's Hymn "As on a Festival Day" in Elucidations on Holderlin's Poetry.

1941 Schelling: Vom Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit, ed. Ingrid Schtisler (Frankfurt a. M: 1988), GA 42. Schelling's Treatise on the Essence of Human Freedom, trans. Joan Stambough (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1985).

1942-43 Parmenides (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1982), GA 54. Parmenides, trans. Andre Schuwer and Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992).

1943 Heraklit, ed. Manfred S. Frings (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1987), GA 55.

1943 "Nietzsches Wort `Gott ist tot " in Holzwege (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1977), GA 5, pp. 205-63. "The Word of Nietzsche: `God is Dead"' in Off the Beaten Track, pp. 157-99.

1946 "Wozu Dichter?" in Holzwege, pp. 265-316. "Why Poets?" in Off the Beaten Track, pp. 200-41.

1950 "Das Ding" in Vortrage and Aufsatze (Pfullingen: Neske, 1954), pp. 163-85. "The Thing," in Poetry, Language, Thought, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), pp. 163-82.

1953 "Die Frage nach der Technik" in Vortrage and Aufsatze, pp. 9-40. "The Question Concerning Technology" in The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), pp. 3-35. Also in Basic Writings, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: Harper & Row, 1993), pp. 311-41.

1953 "Die Kehre" in Die Technik and die Kehre (Pfullingen: Neske, 1962). "The Turning," in The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays, pp. 36-49.

KARL JASPERS

1913 Allgemeine Psychopathologie: Ein Leitfaden fur Studierenden, Arzte and Psychologen (Berlin: Springer, 1913). General Psychopathology, 8th ed., trans. J. Hoenig and M. W. Hamilton (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).

1919 Psychologie der Weltanschauungen (Berlin: Springer, 1919)

1922 Strandberg and van Gogh: Versuch einer pathographischen Analyse unter vergleichender Heranziehung von Swedenborg and Holderlin (Bern: Bincher, 1922). Strindberg and van Gogh, trans. O. Grunow and D. Woloshin (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977).

1923 Die Idee der Universitat (Berlin: Springer, 1923).

1924 Schellings Philosophic (Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1924).

1932 Max Weber- Politiker-Forscher-Philosoph (Oldenburg: Stolling, 1932).

1935 Vernunft and Existenz: Fiinf Vorlesungen (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1935). Reason and Existenz 3d ed., trans. W. Earle (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1997).

1936 Nietzsche: Einfiihrung in das Verstandnis seines Philosophierens (Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1936). Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of His Philosophical Activity, trans. C. F. Wallraff and F. J. Schmitz (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1963).

1937 Descartes and die Philosophie (Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1937).

1938 Existenzphilosophie.• Drei Vorlesungen (Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1938). Philosophy of Existence, 3d ed., trans. Richard F. Grabau (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971).

1945-46 Erneuerung der Universitat in Die Wandlung, I, no. 1, pp. 66-74.

1945-46 "Geleitwort" in Die Wandlung. Eine Monatschrift. Unter Mitwirkung von KarlJaspers, Werner Kraus und Alfred Weber, ed. Dolf Sternberger, Issue I, 1945-56, no. 1, pp. 3-6.

1945-56 Philosophi, vol. I, Philosophische Weltorentierung; vol. II, Existenz Erhellung; vol. III, Metaphysik (Berlin: Springer, 1932). Philosophy, 3 vols., trans. E. B. Ashton (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969-71).

1946 Die Idee der Universitat (Berlin: Springer, 1946)-not the same as the 1923 publication with the same title. The Idea of the University, ed. K. W. Deutsch, trans. H. A. T. Reiche and H. F. Vanderschmidt (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959).

1946 Nietzsche and das Christentum (Hameln: B0cherstube Seifert, 1946). Nietzsche and Christianity, trans. E. B. Ashton (Chicago: Regnery, 1961).

1946 Die Schuldfrage (Heidelberg: Schneider, 1946 and Zurich: Artimis, 1946). The Question of German Guilt, trans. E. B. Ashton (New York: Dial Press, 1947).

1946-47 Vom europaischen Geist (Munich: Piper, 1947). Originally appeared in French: L'Espirit europeen (1946).

1947 Von der Wahrheit: Philosophische Logik, Erster Band (Munich: Piper, 1947). Truth and Symbol, trans. J. T. Wilde, W. Kluback, W. Kimmel (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1959).

1948 "Philosophic and Wissenschaft" Inaugural Address at the University of Basel, in Die Wandlung 3-1948, pp. 721-33.

1948 Unsere Zukunft and Goethe (Zurich, 1948).

1949 Goethes Menschlichkeit (Basel, 1949).

1949 Vom Ursprung and Ziel der Geschichte (Zurich: Artimis, 1949). The Origin and Goal of History, trans. M. Bullock (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

1950 Vernunft and Widervernunft in unserer Zeit: Drei Gastvorlesungen (Munich: Piper, 1950). Reason and Anti-reason in our Time, trans. S. Goodman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952).

1961 "Heidelberger Erinnerungen" in Heidelberger jahrbucher V, ed. University Society of Heidelberg (Berlin, Gottingen, Heidelberg, 1961), pp. 1-10.

1963 Lebensfragen der deutschen Politik (Munich, 1963).

1977 Philosophische Autobiographic expanded edition, including the chapter on Heidegger (Munich: Piper, 1977).

1978 Notizen zu Martin Heidegger, ed. Hans Saner (Munich: Piper, 1989).

INDEX

Listings are indexed according to the number of the letter as ordered in this volume. Hence: 85 n3 refers to letter 85, note 3.

Andreas, Willy, 85 n3
Arendt, Hannah, 83, 83 n4, 83 n5, 83 n7, 87 n1, 117 n2, 141 n1, 149, 149 n7, 149 n9, 155 n2
Aristotle, 5, 5 n3, 9, 10, 12, 12 n4, 12 n8, 16 n4, 22, 30, 39, 43, 43 n1, 53, 122

Baeumler, Alfred, 62, 62 n2, 67, 67 n3, 73, 75, 83, 114, 114 n1, appendix
Bauch, Bruno, 23, 23 n8, 41, 56
Bauer, Clemens, 125 n6
Baumgarten, Eduard, 125, 125 n6, 126, appendix
Baumgartner, Walter, 62 n4
Becher, Erich, 41, 41 n 5, 56, 56 n3
Becker, Carl Heinrich, 13 n6, 23 n5, 34, 34 n4, 37, 37 n1
Becker, Oskar, 62, 62 n1, 54, 67, 68, 72, 73, 75, 83, 107, 108

being (*Sein*), 9, 14 n4, 29, 30, 69 n2, 124 n2, 127, 129, 130, 131, 134, 144, 149, 149 n10
Berg, Bengt, 60, 60 n2
Bergson, Henri, 70, 70 n3
Bessler, Heinrich, 103, 103 n2
Birt, Theodor, 28 n1
Böckmann, Paul, 149 n6
Bollnow, Otto Friedrich, 133, 133 n16
Brecht, Franz Joseph, 133, 133 n15
Brock, Werner, 107, 107 n1, 108, 109, appendix
Bultmann, Rudolf, 22, 22 n3, 62 n4, 65 n4
Burckhardt, Jacob, 13, 67, 130 n3, 133, 133 n9, 151, 151 n2
Buschor, Ernst, 102, 102 n3

Cassierer, Ernst, 23, 23 n6, 24, 41, 69, 69 n1, 69 n2, 80 n2, 83 n2, 101, 102, 108

Clarke, Samuel, 140, 140 n4
Curtius, Ernst Robert, 132, 132 n2, 133
Curtius, Ludwig, 15, 15 n4, 61, 102 n3

Dasein, 9, 69 n2, 69 n3, 86 n2
de Saussure, Horace Bénédict, 71, 71 n1, 71 n2
Descartes, René, 3
Dilthey, Wilhelm, 3, 3 n3, 51, 51 n4, 70
Driesch, Hans, 7 n1, 41, 41 n2
Dürr, Emil, 151 n2
Dyroff, Adolf, 56, 56 n7, 73

Ebbinghaus, Julius, 24, 24 n2, 24 n3, 67, 68, 83
Erdmann, Johann Eduard, 44, 44 n4

Fabricius, Ernst, 80, 80 n1
Faust, August, 108 n1
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 84, 84 n1
Finke, Heinrich, 3, 3 n7, 4
Fischer, Kuno, 42, 42 n2, 44, 44 n5
Fraenkel, Eduard, 126, appendix
Frank, Erich, 24, 24 n1, 28, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 72, 73, 75, 128, 128 n2, 129, 129 n1
Freytag, Bruno (von Freytag-Löringhoff), 56, 56 n5
Friedländer, Paul, 28 n1

Geiger, Afra, 2, 2 n2, 3, 3 n6, 4, 7, 8, 27, 27 n2, 155 n5
Geiger, Moritz, 12, 12 n5
Gentner, Alice, 149 n2
Gentner, Wolfgang, 149, 149 n2
George, Stefan, 54, 149

Glöckner, Hermann, 108 n1
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 24 n5, 132, 132 n1, 132 n2, 135
Göring, Hermann, 142
Gotschlich, Emil, 85 n3
Grassi, Ernesto, 52, 52 n1, 53, 54
Grisebach, Eberhard, 74, 74 n2
Gundolf, Friedrich, 54, 54 n8, 102
Günther, Paul, 144 n4

Häberlin, Paul, 125 n2
Hartmann, Nicolai, 16, 16 n2, 23, 23 n5, 28, 60, 62, 101, 144
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 29, 29 n3, 30, 31, 32, 34, 38, 38 n2, 42, 43, 43 n1, 43 n2, 44, 51 n4, 67, 69, 69 n6, 84, 84 n1, 138 n2, 144, 155
Heidegger, Elfride, 5, 45 n4
Heidegger, Friedrich, 18, 18 n1, 21
Heidegger, Fritz, 26, 26 n1
Heidegger, Hermann, 12 n6, 122, 122 n6, 129, 130, 139
Heidegger, Johanna, 41, 45, 45 n1, 46
Heidegger, Jörg, 12 n6, 120, 122, 129, 130, 136, 139
Heidegger, Martin (writings)
"As on a Festival Day," 124 n3
The Basic Problems of Phenomenology, 43 n1
Being and Time, 23 n5, 32, 32 n1, 34 n3, 35, 39, 41, 43, 44, 44 n1, 44 n2, 47 n5, 69, 69 n2, 69 n4, 69 n7, 70 n2, 82 n2, 109 n2, 110, 126 n11, 131 n4, 135 n2
"Comments on Karl Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews,*" 1 n3, 5 n1, 6 n1, 7 n3, 7 n4, 7 n5, 9, 10, 47 n5, 145 n3

The Essence of Reasons (Vom Wesen des Grundes), 83, 83 n3
The Field Path (Der Feldweg), 136, 136 n2, 137
History of the Concept of Time, 3 n2, 23, 23 n3
"Hölderlin and the Essence of Poetry," 122, 122 n1, 123
Introduction to Metaphysics, 120, 120 n2
Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics, 82, 82 n1, 86, 86 n1, 110, 110 n3, 145, 145 n1
"Letter on Humanism," 131, 131 n1, 131 n4, 131 n5, 132, 132 n7, 133, 133 n8, 134, 134 n4, 149 n10
Nietzsche, 122, 122 n3, 124 n4
"On the Essence of Truth," 131 n1, 139, 139 n3
Off the Beaten Track (Holzwege), 136, 136 n3, 139, 140, 140 n5, 140 n6, 140 n7, 140 n8, 140 n9, 140 n10, 140 n11, 144
"Plato's Doctrine of Truth," 124, 124 n2, 124 n9, 124 n10, 124 n11, 124 n12, 131 n3
Schelling's Treatise on the Essence of Human Freedom, 122, 122 n5
"The Self-Assertion of the German University," 114 n4, 119, 119 n1, 119 n2
"What is Metaphysics?" (1929), 90, 90 n1
What is Metaphysics? (5th, expanded edition, 1949), 130, 130 n4, 131 n1, 135 n2
Heiler, Friedrich, 62 n4

Heimsoeth, Heinz, 67, 67 n2
Heiß, Robert, 22, 22 n2, 127
Heinsheimer, Karl, 85 n3
Heraclitus, 132
Hermelink, Heinrich, 62 n4
Herrigel, Eugen, 85, 85 n2, 108 n1
Hitler, Adolf, 117 n2, 142, 149
Hoffmann, Ernst, 23, 23 n10, 31, 33, 35, 102, 108
Hofmannsthal, Hugo, 149
Hölderlin, Friedrich, 122, 123, 124, 133
Huch, Ricarda, 14, 14 n3
Hühnerfeld, Paul, 138 n1, 138 n3
Husserl, Edmund, Trans. Intro., 2 n2, 3, 3 n2, 8, 11, 11 n4, 14, 14 n2, 16 n4, 16, 16 n5, 17 n3, 32 n1, 33, 34, 39, 51, 51 n4, 65 n4, 70, 80, 83 n4, 85, 86, 86 n2

Jacobsthal, Paul, 60, 60 n1, 74 n1
Jaeger, Werner, 32, 32 n3, 77, 77 n2, 101
Jaensch, Erich Rudolf, 23, 23 n4, 37, 41, 60
Jantzen, Hans, 78, 78 n2, 79, 80, 83
Jaspers, Carl Wilhelm, 89 n2
Jaspers, Enno E., 35 n1
Jaspers, Gertrud, 47 n1, 97 n1, 126, 126 n7
Jaspers, Henriette, 89 n2
Jaspers, Karl (writings)
Descartes and Philosophy, 124 n6
General Psychopathology, 10, 10 n1, 10 n3, 14, 14 n1
"Goethe's Humanity" (*Goethes Menschlichkeit*), 132, 132 n1
The Great Philosophers, 151 n6, 155

The Idea of the University (1923), 17, 17 n2, 19, 19 n1, 20, 29, 33, 65, 155 n5
The Idea of the University (1946), 133, 133 n4, 143
Man in the Modern Age, 108, 108 n2, 109 n1
Max Weber: Politician-Researcher-Philosopher (Max Weber: Politiker-Forscher-Philosoph), 111, 111 n1
Nietzsche and Christianity, 143
Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of His Philosophical Activity, 120, 121 n1, 122, 122 n2, 124, 124 n4
Notes on Martin Heidegger (Notizen zu Martin Heidegger), 69 n8, 119 n2, 152 n4, 155 n5
On the European Spirit (*Vom europäischen Geist*), 133, 133 n10, 134 n1
The Origin and Goal of History (*Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*), 133, 133 n11, 133 n12, 133 n13, 134 n1, 138 n1, 138 n3, 139 n1
"Our Future and Goethe" (*Unsere Zukunft und Goethe*), 132, 132 n1
Philosophical Autobiography (Philosophische Autobiographie), 2 n2, 7 n4, 10 n2, 19 n1, 47 n5, 115 n1, 117 n2
Philosophische Forschungen, 23, 23 n2, 83 n4
Philosophy, 41, 41 n1, 47 n4, 47 n7, 48, 51, 51 n2, 70 n1, 108 n2, 109, 109 n1, 111, 114, 120, 122, 123, 129, 146, 146 n5

"Philosophy and Science" (*Philosophie und Wissenschaft*), 132, 132 n1
Philosophy of Existence, 124 n6
The Psychology of Worldviews (Psychologie der Weltanschauungen), 1 n3, 3 n4, 3 n8, 4, 4 n1, 5 n1, 6, 6 n1, 6 n2, 7 n4, 9, 10, 10 n2, 11, 29, 41, 47 n5, 110, 145, 146
The Question of German Guilt, 143, 144 n1, 145, 149
Questions of Life for German Politics, 155 n4
Reason and Existenz, 120, 120 n1
Schellings Philosophie, 32, 32 n5, 46
Strindberg and Van Gogh, 9 n1
The Transformation (
Die Wandlung), 125, 126, 139
Truth and Symbol, 146, 146 n3, 146 n4
Jonas, Hans, 65, 65 n4, 66, 69

Kaegi, Werner, 130 n3, 151 n2, 151 n3
Kant, Immanuel, 16 n4, 20, 20 n1, 24, 24 n1, 29, 29 n3, 39, 42 n2, 47, 53, 54, 71, 80, 80 n2, 81 n1, 82, 86, 122, 126 n11, 130, 151
Kern, Eduard, 144 n5
Kierkegaard, Søren, Trans. Intro., 14, 70, 71, 71 n3, 81 n1, 126 n11
Knapps, Georg Friedrich, 54, 54 n3
Kraepelin, Emil, 10, 10 n5
Kraus, Werner, 133 n5
Krieck, Ernst, 114, 114 n1
Kristeller, Paul-Oskar, 33, 33 n3, 34, 34 n2, 35

Kroner, Richard, 7, 7 n2, 11, 11 n3, 16, 31, 67, 74

Lampe, Adolf, appendix
Lao Tze, 132, 133
Lederer, Emil, 22, 22 n1, 54
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 140, 140 n4
Lenin, V. I., 133 n3
Lenz, Friedrich, 54, 54 n13
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 132, 132 n4
Litt, Theodor, 54, 54 n4
Lommatzsch, Ernst, 28 n1
Lotze, Rudolph Hermann, 36 n3
Löwith, Karl, 3, 3 n5, 8, 12, 21, 31, 155 n5
Lukács, Georg, 132, 132 n3, 133, 133 n2
Luther, Martin, 151

Maaß, Ernst, 28 n1
Mahnke, Dietrich, 41, 41 n4, 49, 51, 51 n3, 51 n4
Maier, Heinrich, 31, 31 n3, 32
Mannheim, Karl, 8, 8 n2, 108
Marcuse, Herbert, 69 n5
Marseille, Walter, 21, 21 n2
Martius, Heidwig, 14, 14 n4
Marx Karl, 149 n10, 155
Meister, Karl, 95 n3
Mende, Georg, 133 n3
Meyer, Arthur, 47 n3
Meyer, David, 47, 47 n2
Meyer, Dodo, 47, 47 n3
Meyer, Ernst, 115 n2
Michelangelo, 122, 135
Misch, Georg, 11, 11 n2, 12, 13
Möllendorf, Wilhelm v., 144, 144 n2

Myake, Gôchi, 106, 106 n1

Natorp, Paul, 12, 12 n1
Nebel, Gerhard, 23, 23 n11, 31
Neumann, Carl, 78 n1, 102 n4
Neumann, Friedrich, 1, 2, 2 n1, 3, 3 n1, 4
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 13, 13 n8, 119, 120, 122, 122 n3, 122 n4, 123, 123 n2, 123 n3, 126 n11, 132, 133, 133 n14, 138, 138 n2, 144, 152 n4

Oehlkers, Friedrich, appendix
Olschki, Leonardo, 103, 103 n3
Oncken, Hermann, 1 n1, 15, 15 n2
Ortega y Gasset, José, 139, 139 n2
Ott, Hugo, 125 n6, 125 n9
Otto, Walter F., 32, 32 n2
Overbeck, Franz, 13, 13 n8

Panofsky (Panovsky), Erwin, 78, 78 n4, 80, 102, 102 n4
Paquin, Grete, 125 n6
Parmenides, 114, 132, 133
Pascal, Blaise, 105
Pfänder, Alexander, 14 n2
Phenomenology, 2 n2, 3 n2, 14, 14 n4, 16, 31, 33, 42, 51 n4, 72, 86 n2, 110
Philosophy, Trans. Intro., 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 10 n2, 11, 12, 13, 13 n7, 16, 24, 34, 39, 41, 45, 47 n5, 50, 51, 70, 86 n2, 102, 109, 110, 111, 114, 119, 119 n2, 122, 123, 124 n4, 124 n12, 126, 126 n11, 127, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135 n2, 138, 140, 144, 145, 146, 149, 151, 152 n4, 155, appendix
Pichler, Hans, 41, 41 n3, 65

Plato, 9, 30, 39, 124, 124 n12, 125, 125 n8, 126 n11, 129, 130, 134, 138, 138 n2, 151

Rathenau, Walther, 13 n3, 13 n4
Rembrandt, 135
Rheinfelder, Hans, 103, 103 n1, 105
Richter, Werner, 16, 16 n1, 28, 58, 58 n2, 65, 65 n3, 66, 72, 101
Rickert, Heinrich, 5, 5 n2, 7 n4, 24 n1, 31 n4, 38, 38 n3, 39, 72, 72 n2, 85 n2, 102 n1, 107, 107 n2, 108, 108 n1
Riezler, Kurt, 88, 88 n1
Rilke, Rainer Maria, 133, 40, 149
Ritschl, Albrecht, 54 n11
Ritschl, Hans, 54, 54 n10
Ritschl, Otto, 54 n11
Ritter, Gerhard, appendix
Rosenkrantz, Johan Carl Friedrich, 43, 43 n3, 44, 44 n3
Rossmann, Kurt, 149 n6
Rothacker, Erich, 36, 36 n2, 56, 56 n6, 65, 72, 72 n3, 73

Salditt, Maria, 50, 50 n1, 51, 51 n1
Salz, Arthur, 54, 54 n7
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 133 n2
Sauer, Joseph, 114 n3, 144, 144 n3
Sawatzki, Günther, 139, 139 n5
Schadewalt, Wolfgang, 114, 114 n2
Scheel, Gustav Adof, 119 n3, 155 n5
Scheler, Maria, 88, 88 n2
Scheler, Max, 12, 12 n7, 13, 16 n2, 65, 65 n2, 66 n1, 73 n3, 74, 74 n5, 82 n1, 88 n2
Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph, 32, 32 n6, 46, 50, 53, 84, 84 n1, 122, 133, 135 n2, 144

Schirmer, Walter Franz, 73, 73 n3
Schmitt, Carl, appendix
Schmitthenner, Paul, 142 n2
Scholz, Heinrich, 23, 23 n9
Schwarz, Justus, 67, 67 n1
Schwörer, Viktor, 56, 56 n1, 58, 58 n1, 60
Shi-Yi Hsiao, Paul, 132 n5
Singer, Kurt, 54, 54 n1, 54 n2, 54 n5
Soden (von Soden), Hans, 124 n13
Sophocles, 120
Spengler, Oswald, 1, 1 n1
Spinoza, Baruch, 117 n2, 125, 125 n7, 133
Stalin, Josef, 144, 149
Steiniger, Peter, 133 n3
Stenzel, Julius, 62, 62 n3, 67, 68
Sternberger, Dolf, 110, 110 n3
Störring, Gustav, 36, 36 n1
Strindberg, August, 9
Szilasi, Wilhelm, 17, 17 n3

Tellenbach, Gerd, 125 n10, 136, 136 n1, 136 n4
Tillich, Paul, 74, 74 n3, 110 n3, 110 n5
Troeltsch, Ernst, 16 n5
Tulpanov, Sergi I., 133, 133 n3

Van Gogh, Vincent, 9
Varnhagen, Rahel, 83, 83 n7
Victorius, Käte, 135, 135 n2
Virchow, Rudolf, 54, 54 n15
von Baden, Friedrich (Grand Duke), 42, 42 n1
von Dietze, Constantin, appendix
von Eckardt, Hans Felix, 54, 54 n6
Vossler, Karl, 103 n3

Wahl, Jean, 126, 126 n9, 126 n10, 126 n11
Walther, Gerda, 14, 14 n2
Walz, Hans, 131 n2, 152 n2
Weber, Alfred, 53, 53 n2, 54, 85 n3, 102
Weber, Marianne, 24, 24 n4, 125 n6
Weber, Max, 13, 13 n2, 13 n4, 24 n4, 54, 69, 77, 111, 111 n2, 112, 125, 126, 151 n4, appendix
Weiß, Helene, 33, 33 n2, 41
Wende, Erich, 13 n5
Wentscher, Max, 36, 36 n3, 73
Wertheimer, Max, 74, 74 n4, 75
Wilser, Julius, 141, 141 n4, 142
Windelband, Wilhelm, 24 n1, 31, 31 n4, 39, 39 n2, 41, 65, 75, 75 n3
Wundt, Max, 23, 23 n7, 41
Wundt, Wilhelm, 36 n1

Zeller, Eduard, 124 n12

This letter was not sent.

'This letter was not sent.

This letter was not sent.

*This letter was not sent.

*This letter was not sent.

*The Introduction to the 5th edition (1949) of "What is Metaphysics?"